

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



## **The Teaching of Jesus in the Gospel According to St. Mark.**

Rodd, C. S

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

### **END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT**



**Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page** this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK

by

Cyril Stanley Rodd

Ph.D. Thesis

King's College

### ABSTRACT

This study examines the way in which Mark understood the teaching of Jesus. Mark carefully distinguishes the audiences whom Jesus addresses and this forms the basis for the discussion.

Beginning with the problem that Mark frequently refers to Jesus as Teacher and depicts him as teaching the crowd yet includes a relatively small amount of that teaching in his gospel, it is argued that to Mark διδάσκαλος was an honorific title and that he believed that Jesus' public teaching was in enigmatic 'parables' which needed to be explained if they were to be understood.

Although the sayings addressed to opponents are commonly appealed to in discussions of the ethical teaching of Jesus, it is suggested that for Mark these pericopae reveal Jesus as the one who could vanquish all his adversaries, the content of Jesus' replies being of minor significance.

The teaching which Jesus gives to the Twelve is therefore of central importance. Two main themes are discovered, eschatological teaching and sayings which present a rigorist ethic. On the basis of these sayings it is argued that Mark believed that with the coming of John the Baptist the predetermined events leading up to the end of the world had been put into motion and that the parousia was imminent. Because Mark does not envisage a long period of history, the ethical teaching of Jesus which he includes in his gospel is almost entirely rigorist. He sees the chief dangers to Christian discipleship as Satan, persecution and riches, and believes that these temptations will be intensified as the End approaches.

In the concluding chapter tentative suggestions are made concerning the purpose and date of Mark's gospel and its relation to 2 Thessalonians, and whether Mark has correctly presented the message of Jesus himself.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	2
Introduction	4
Chapter I. Jesus the Teacher in Mark.	8
Chapter II. Jesus and his Opponents.	55
Chapter III. The Teaching given to the Disciples I.	79
Chapter IV. The Teaching given to the Disciples II.	122
Chapter V. Conclusion.	158
 Notes	
Introduction	170
Chapter I	173
Chapter II	190
Chapter III	200
Chapter IV	222
Chapter V	234
Table I      ῥαββι and διδασκαλος	238
Table II     διδασκειν and διδαχη	239
Table III    The Logia	240
Table IV     The Pattern of the Sayings	246
Bibliography	247



## INTRODUCTION

In recent years revived interest in the historical Jesus has led to a variety of attempts to devise tests by which the authentic teaching of Jesus may be distinguished from the sayings which were later attributed to him by the early church. Some of these tests go back to the beginning of the century<sup>(1)</sup>, others have had to await the rise of redaction criticism<sup>(2)</sup>. Most employ some form of the criterion of 'distinctiveness', based on the alleged differences between the teaching of Jesus and the ideas of the early Christians and of first century Judaism. The methodology has been widely discussed and there is no need to re-examine the different kinds of tests<sup>(3)</sup>. Most writers recognize that none of the tests is fully satisfactory since the more stringent the criteria the more probable it is that genuine sayings will be discarded, while any less rigorous procedure fails to provide hard evidence that the ipsissima verba of Jesus have been recovered. As has been frequently pointed out, what is required is the presentation of the characteristic teaching of Jesus, and not merely a collection of unique sayings which would almost certainly present a distorted picture of the historical Jesus in detaching him completely from the Palestinian Judaism in which he grew up and from the church which was composed of those who were his followers.

Underlying all such attempts is one correct observation and a number of more questionable assumptions. The correct observation is that, leaving aside a few isolated sayings, we are completely dependent for our knowledge of Jesus upon the four gospel writers. So far as we know Jesus wrote down none of his teaching, and even if he did all trace of this has been lost. The sole evidence, therefore, consists of the gospels.

The assumptions are of varied probability. It is known that in the early church there were Christian prophets, and it is often assumed that they produced a large number of sayings in the name of Jesus and that the first Christians were neither able nor concerned to distinguish between these sayings of the glorified Lord and the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. It is plain from a comparison of the synoptic gospels that the writers modified both narratives



and teaching, and it is sometimes assumed that they had little interest in the historical Jesus and wrote their gospels solely for theological purposes<sup>(4)</sup>. It is clear that three broadly defined groups or individuals interacted to produce the gospels, first century Judaism, Jesus, and the early church including the gospel writers themselves, and it is too easily assumed that we possess detailed and exact knowledge of the first and the last of these and that the only unknown is the central figure.

In addition to these assumptions certain answers to questions concerning the literary relations between the synoptic gospels and the history of the tradition are accepted. This is inevitable, since it is impossible to argue every issue from first principles, but the doubts which have recently been expressed about the validity of the two document hypothesis and the success of form criticism in reconstructing the tradition need to be remembered<sup>(5)</sup>.

It is not the intention of the present study to provide any fresh tests for recovering the teaching of Jesus. On the contrary, it is maintained that the piece-meal approach which examined each saying and pericope individually has failed to lead us back to the Jesus of history. The approach sprang out of scepticism, and the nature of the evidence is such that no logically satisfying answers to this scepticism can be found. This may mean that it is impossible to recover any genuine 'tape-recorded' sayings of Jesus. It may be, however, that it is the very fragmentation which is at fault and that some new approach is needed if we are to get back to Jesus himself.

Older scholars assumed that what we possess in the New Testament are three photographs of Jesus, taken from slightly different angles, and a portrait painted by an artist of superb interpretative genius. It is now generally agreed that we have four portraits, or, perhaps rather more accurately, four identikit pictures or artist's impressions derived from the descriptions of witnesses, mostly at third or fourth hand. That the sole evidence we possess consists of these gospel pictures must be our starting point. The fact that the evangelists wrote a narrative means that, while they are not historians in the modern sense, and did not set out to write a biography of Jesus,



they did not cut themselves completely loose from historical events, and they produced accounts which are not too far removed from a 'life'. It will be assumed, therefore, that the gospel writers were concerned to anchor their descriptions in some way in historical events, however idealised or 'theological' their view of those events may have been. Their aim in writing was doubtless directed immediately to the situation of their readers, but the fact that they chose this narrative form is of considerable importance in understanding their purpose.

Since it is impossible to proceed without adopting some attitude towards the synoptic problem it will be assumed that Mark<sup>(6)</sup> was the earliest gospel and was used by Matthew and Luke. It will also be assumed that Matthew and Luke possessed some common traditions, although it will be left an open question whether these existed as a document, and where the symbol Q is used it will simply designate these common traditions. It is assumed that Mark did not know Q<sup>(7)</sup>. Whether he had access to a greater number of sayings by Jesus than he includes in his gospel remains undetermined, although on the whole it is felt that he had<sup>(8)</sup>.

While some use will be made of the Markan seams and other redactional passages as evidence for Mark's thought, attention will not be limited to these for two reasons. Firstly, it is impossible to determine precisely the extent of the Markan redaction, for the form of the pericopae as they came to Mark is unknown and arguments from style and vocabulary tend to be circular, and Mark may well have introduced changes into the pericopae as extensively as Matthew modified the passages he received from Mark. Secondly, to concentrate solely on the redactional passages commits the same error as is seen in many of the tests of the authenticity of the sayings of Jesus, i.e. it assumes that Mark's ideas never coincided with those belonging to the pericopae, although he was responsible for selecting and including them in his gospel<sup>(9)</sup>.

The basic approach of this study is that the completed gospel of Mark must be the unit which has to be analyzed. It is not accepted that Mark was too clumsy an editor to exercise

adequate control over his material, and while some tensions and inconsistencies may be detected, it is assumed that he possessed a clear picture of the life and teaching of Jesus which he wished to present. The attempt will, therefore, be made to discover the way in which Mark conceived Jesus as a teacher, a title which occurs frequently in this gospel. Because Mark carefully distinguishes between the audiences to whom the teaching is given, the teaching addressed to opponents and that given to the disciples will be considered separately. In this way the study aims to constitute a first stage in the recovery of the teaching of Jesus himself. To proceed further in that investigation would involve examining the other synoptic gospels in the same way, and then, from the three pictures which have been delineated, to attempt to discover what the Man was like who inspired these portraits<sup>(10)</sup>.



Chapter IJESUS THE TEACHER IN MARK

The contrast between Mark's extensive use of the vocabulary connected with teaching and the relatively small amount of teaching included in his gospel has frequently been noted<sup>(1)</sup>. Jesus is addressed as διδασκαλε or ραββι/ραββουνι rather than as κυριε or επιστατα and his activity is frequently described by the words διδασκειν and διδαχη, yet only some 42% of the gospel consists of the words of Jesus, compared with 63% in Matthew and 62% in Luke<sup>(2)</sup>. Why does Mark portray Jesus as a teacher and yet present so little of his teaching? This is a difficult question for the detection of Mark's understanding of the work and person of Jesus and of his purpose in writing his gospel, and several answers to it have been suggested.

One answer from the standpoint of form criticism is that of Dibelius who argued that different laws of transmission applied to the handing down of the actual words of Jesus and to the gathering together of the narratives of his miracles and other actions which comprise so large a part of Mark's gospel. Thus it was natural for Mark to keep the two separate, and they were not fully combined until Matthew<sup>(3)</sup>. Bultmann accepts this explanation, and agrees with Dibelius that the question is not, 'Why had Mark only a selection of dominical sayings to offer?' but rather, 'Why did he include any at all?' His explanation is that Mark's purpose was to unite the 'hellenistic kerygma about Christ', the content of which was the Christ-myth found in Paul (especially seen in Phil 2:6-11 and Rom 3:24), with the tradition of the story of Jesus. He achieved this by collecting apophthegms and miracle stories, since the latter alone would have been too meagre for his purpose. The apophthegms provided a bridge to the sayings, and Mark, therefore, was led to include a selection of these, although they did not fully accord with his purpose, and he approximated them to the apophthegmatic form<sup>(4)</sup>.

These explanations rightly draw attention to the large number of miracles in Mark's gospel and to his apparent preference for apophthegms, especially conflict pronouncement stories<sup>(5)</sup>. It is, indeed, partly the predominance of this type of teaching which reduces the proportion of dominical words in this gospel.



Nevertheless, certain objections must be raised against this as offering a complete explanation of the problem. In the first place Bultmann has failed to explain adequately why the sayings should have been included. To speak of the apophthegms as the bridge by which they entered the gospel is not an explanation. Even if Bultmann's hypothesis of Mark's purpose is accepted, it is not clear why Mark should have included any sayings. On Bultmann's view the apophthegms were included for their narrative elements rather than for their teaching, and a major difference of intention is involved in moving from the words of Jesus which are included within the apophthegms to the sayings which have no narrative framework and must therefore either be provided with such or be loosely attached to other material. Secondly, it is by no means certain that the different types of tradition were rigidly isolated in the early Christian communities. On the one hand the apophthegms and sayings are remarkably varied in form and content, while on the other hand, since the existence of Q is still much debated, there is no proof of the existence of any collections of the teaching of Jesus outside the canonical gospels<sup>(6)</sup>. Thirdly, as Stein rightly points out<sup>(7)</sup>, Bultmann's theory does not take into account Mark's emphasis upon Jesus as the teacher. The problem is not why Mark included any teaching but why he wrote a gospel which appears to place the stress upon the actions of Jesus and yet both included some teaching and specifically designated Jesus as one who taught.

Other answers to the problem are related to the question of Mark's knowledge of the teaching of Jesus. E. Best suggests that Mark may have possessed no more teaching than he included in his gospel<sup>(8)</sup>. This assertion it is impossible either to substantiate or to refute, but some pointers in its favour can be indicated. It would provide an explanation of curious features of Mark's gospel if Mark knew a tradition which presented Jesus as a 'teacher', either as a rabbi surrounded by a circle of disciples or as one who taught the crowds publicly, and yet possessed little of his teaching. He might then be obliged to include every fragment of teaching which he knew, and this might be the reason why such ambiguous and enigmatic sayings as 4:21 or 9:49 are found in the gospel, or why Mark says that Jesus



explained the parables to the disciples and yet includes two parables in chapter 4 without any interpretations. Stein<sup>(9)</sup> objects to the theory on the ground that it is incredible that Mark should have possessed no more teaching than is found in his gospel, especially if he is to be identified with John Mark, the friend of Peter, Paul and Barnabas, whose home was the meeting place of the early church. Dibelius, on the other hand, followed by Meye<sup>(10)</sup>, argued on the basis of 4:2, 33-34 and 12:38 that Mark intended his record to be only a selection from a larger tradition. It is clear from these passages that Mark believed that Jesus gave more teaching than he included in his gospel. It does not necessarily follow, however, that he possessed this teaching. The examples which he gives may have been the only teaching which had come down to him, or he may have himself selected the parables and other teaching from a larger body of tradition. Both interpretations are possible<sup>(11)</sup>. The question is intimately related to the problem of whether Mark knew Q. It will be convenient here to note two views which explain the problem in terms of Mark's attitude to this source.

Streeter<sup>(12)</sup> suggested that Mark may have written for a church which possessed Q and that he intended to supplement this collection of teaching, though later he changed his mind and decided that the evidence was against the view that Mark used Q<sup>(13)</sup>. W.D. Davies<sup>(14)</sup> argued that Mark wrote to counter what he believed was an over emphasis upon the teaching of Jesus in Q. Against this latter view Stein claims that the emphasis which Mark gives to the teaching activity of Jesus contradicts the idea that he was seeking to minimize his teaching. These two views stand or fall on the answer to the question of whether Mark knew Q. This much debated question cannot be considered at length here<sup>(15)</sup>. The balance of the arguments offered seems to favour the judgement that Mark did not know this hypothetical document and that he derived the sayings and parables from another source, either oral tradition or catechetical material collected in one of the great churches. If he did know Q the enigma of his depicting Jesus as a teacher and yet including so little teaching from this source, in spite of the fact that he did not omit the whole of the sayings found in the material common to Matthew and



Luke becomes even more puzzling.

Somewhat different answers to the question have been given in two recent studies of Jesus the teacher which may be considered separately.

Friedrich Norman<sup>(16)</sup> argues that Jesus is depicted in Mark as akin to the first century rabbis. He draws attention to the frequent occurrence of words from the διδάσκ- stem, the way in which emphasis is placed upon the narrow circle of disciples, and the private teaching in a 'house' where Jesus gives deeper instruction in response to questions, and he notes Daube's comparison of this to rabbinic practice<sup>(17)</sup>. He claims, following Grundmann and Schniewind<sup>(18)</sup>, that 'to be with (Jesus)' (3:14; 5:18) was a technical term for entering a rabbi's school and that the appointment of the Twelve was similar to the founding of such a school. He sees a considerable amount of teaching in Mark's gospel (he refers to 4:3-32 as 'das grosse Redestück') and suggests that the detailed concrete teaching may be derived from 'Gemeinde-katechese'. Norman gives two reasons for Mark's portrait of Jesus as a teacher: first, that it was the way in which Jesus was viewed in the living tradition and went back to historical fact (and this is supported by the picture of Jesus in the Talmud), and second, that in the church there was a need for catechetical instruction and this was seen as foreshadowed in Jesus' teaching of his disciples, for behind the group of disciples the assembled community could see itself, while behind their teacher shone Jesus, the Teacher.

Although Stein commends this as 'perhaps the best explanation so far'<sup>(19)</sup>, it hardly touches the point at issue. Indeed, by stressing the links between Mark's gospel and community catechesis Norman only underlines the problem. If this really was Mark's intention, one would have expected him to have produced a gospel more like that of Matthew.

R.P. Meye has conducted the most extensive and detailed examination of the 'didactic motif' in Mark's gospel narrative of Jesus' ministry. He approaches the problem from two sides: on the one hand he considers Mark's picture of Jesus the teacher, and on the other he discusses the function of the twelve disciples.



Besides examining the terminology used by Mark, he subjects the central part of Mark's narrative to a detailed study and concludes that not merely does Mark describe Jesus' ministry with didactic terminology, but his narrative is so framed that it emphasizes the portrait of Jesus as the divine Teacher of the disciples, his deeds being essentially acted parables<sup>(20)</sup>. He stresses that Jesus is seen as a teacher, not as a prophet, and that his activity is teaching not preaching<sup>(21)</sup>. Meye fully recognizes that this raises the problem that Mark stresses Jesus' didactic ministry but gives no extended account of the διδαχῇ, and that he emphasizes the central importance of the words of Jesus but gives scant account of those words<sup>(22)</sup>. His direct answer to this is to observe that by stressing the teaching Mark prepared for the later gospel writers, who had only to amplify his outline in ways which he himself might well have followed, and also that the relative lack of teaching is to be correlated with two other features of Mark's gospel, the emphasis on the Twelve as the recipients of the teaching and the idea of the messianic secret. Mark's gospel is a book of 'secret epiphanes', as Dibelius said, but the secrecy extends to the words as well as to the deeds of Jesus. Mark assumed that the church would have the continuing Messianic word in its midst<sup>(23)</sup>.

Taking his argument as a whole, therefore, we may summarise Meye's answer to the problem as consisting in three assertions. (1) Mark's gospel is thoroughly didactic. Jesus is depicted primarily as the Teacher, surrounded by a narrow circle of disciples. 'Fullness of teaching is not at all the same as emphasis upon the activity of teaching'<sup>(24)</sup>. (2) A comparison of Mark with the other two gospels can easily distort our appreciation of the centrality of teaching in Mark. Although it might appear that little specific teaching is given in this gospel, this impression is false, since there is both a large quantity of such teaching<sup>(25)</sup>, and much of the narrative describing the actions of Jesus should be seen as teaching and was considered as such by Mark. (3) The relative paucity of the actual words of Jesus is not due to any lack of interest in the historical teaching of Jesus, but is a part of Mark's conception of the messianic secret and his belief that Jesus is not merely the Risen Lord but continues as the



divine Teacher of his disciples in the church.

But compared with Matthew and Luke there is relatively less teaching material, and if Mark's terminology reveals such an important stress upon Jesus the teacher as Meye claims the problem is not quite as slight as he suggests<sup>(26)</sup>. Moreover, if Mark really selected the teaching which he chose to include in his gospel from a much larger body of teaching known to him, this not merely emphasizes the relatively slender amount of the material which he offers but raises the question of why these particular sayings were selected, why there is such a concentration upon pronouncement stories, especially conflict stories, and why, for example, he narrates so many miracles (23 compared with Matthew's 30 and Luke's 24) and so few parables (6 compared with Matthew's 23 and Luke's 29). Further, even if Mark is chiefly concerned to stress the catechetical situation within the church, this in no way alleviates the problem unless it is assumed, either that the teaching was regarded as a secret tradition (but in that case, why was any teaching given, why is the private instruction of the disciples stressed, why is a considerable part of the teaching which is included that which is given to the disciples, and why did an account of the Last Supper find its way into this gospel?), or that there was a sharp discontinuity between the teaching of the historical Jesus and the instruction given within the church under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (which would make Mark more 'Johannine' than John).

Meye's suggestion that fullness of teaching is not the same as emphasis upon the activity of teaching leads on to the final type of explanation which will be considered<sup>(27)</sup>. In his study of the theology of Mark as shown in the vocabulary of the redactional sections of the gospel, E. Schweizer asserts that for Mark teaching was the typical activity of Jesus, and that this was not true in the same sense either of John the Baptist or the church. Mark only gives examples of a much more extensive teaching because, compared with the fact that Jesus taught, the content of that teaching is of secondary importance; the authority of Jesus' teaching is stressed and the teaching is presented as the miraculous activity of God at which everyone is amazed<sup>(28)</sup>. Thus the teaching with authority is a sign that



another dimension, the divine, is breaking in, and thus the teaching is fully parallel to the healings and the exorcisms. Mark uses the life of Jesus to show the difficulties which the revelation meets - the elect do not understand, even those who are taught the secret come no closer to its true meaning than the demons, and the full unveiling of the secret of the suffering Son of man is possible only through the events of the cross and the resurrection. Schweizer concludes by drawing attention to the similarity of this view with that of John<sup>(29)</sup>.

Other writers have put forward similar views. Thus W. Manson argues that for Mark the teaching of Jesus was essentially a sign, a 'Messianic phenomenon'. When Jesus taught things happened. The words of Jesus are parallel to his acts. Both words and acts signify a manifestation of God in history. Manson finds a further reason for Mark's subordination of the content of Jesus' gospel of the kingdom in his understanding of parables as intelligible only to those to whom the mystery of the kingdom has been given (4:11), though he strongly repudiates the view of Bultmann that Mark has transformed a teacher of righteousness into an hellenistic wonder-worker or 'divine man', on the ground that the Palestinian tradition, as found in Q, itself linked the divine revelation in Jesus with the miracles which he worked<sup>(30)</sup>. Nineham suggests that part of the answer to the problem of the surprisingly slender amount of teaching in Mark is due to the fact that he could assume that his readers were already familiar with it, but says that this hardly accounts for the great disparity between Mark and the other two synoptic gospels<sup>(31)</sup>. Mark was concerned to show that Jesus spoke and acted with the divine authority of God's son. Nineham also points out that the early Christians varied in their attitude to the teaching of Jesus, Matthew holding that an essential feature of Christianity was obedience to Christ's new law, and Paul usually seeking answers to ethical problems by reference not to the teaching of Jesus but to the 'mind of Christ' discovered through meditation on the Old Testament and by direct communion with the risen Christ. He suggests that in this Mark was closer to the position of Paul, and notes that the teaching which Mark presents is almost wholly concerned with the person and work of Jesus and not with



matters of conduct<sup>(32)</sup>. Lastly Budersheim, arguing that Mark enlarges upon a tradition which depicted Jesus as a *θεός ἀνθρώπων* in order to produce a figure who is the judge of the section of Jewish law and tradition concerned with cultic purification (in this way revealing the hellenistic, Gentile-Christian background of his gospel), points out that in the redactional verses 1:22 and 1:27 the stress is placed upon the fact that Jesus taught (or more precisely, how Jesus taught) rather than on what he taught<sup>(33)</sup>.

Thus from several different standpoints and stressing a variety of motives, these writers all separate the content of the teaching from the fact that Jesus acted as a teacher, and they argue that Mark's stress on the fact that Jesus taught can be explained from his Christology or from his interpretation of the life of Jesus. Apart from doubts about the interpretations of the person of Christ which underlie some of these views<sup>(34)</sup>, there seem to be two major difficulties with any theory which is based upon a radical distinction drawn between the 'that' and the 'what' of the teaching. First, it may be questioned whether it makes sense to say that the fact that Jesus taught can be stressed while the content of his teaching is regarded as of little importance. A Jewish rabbi may make a similar assertion about the law, but this was possible because the commands were clearly laid down and he was simply demanding obedience to them.<sup>(35)</sup> When, however, Bultmann asserts that Jesus came with a demand for radical obedience which possessed no content<sup>(36)</sup>, Hiers rightly complains that this means that the moral decision is left to take place in an 'existential vacuum', that it is not true of the Jesus as depicted in the gospels, and that Bultmann does not mean this but by 'radical obedience' intends 'radical love of neighbour'<sup>(37)</sup>. It might be argued in reply that it was expected that the future age would bring in a new teaching, but it is not clear whether this was specifically linked with the messiah<sup>(38)</sup>, and even if it was so, the teaching must have been thought to possess some content. Indeed, the greater the authority of the teacher, the greater, one would expect, would be the importance of the actual words he speaks. Teaching by its very nature involves content. Secondly, the argument proves too much and brings us



back to the question which has been raised before: if the content of the teaching was secondary, why was any teaching recorded at all? And if Mark selected from the teaching which he received from the tradition those sayings which were in accord with his dominant interests, be they Christological, the Passion, or the conflict with Judaism or with the demons, why does he include other types of teaching as well?

Far from producing any definite answer to the problem, this survey has served only to draw attention to its magnitude. Many of these writers have pointed to the extensive teaching vocabulary found in Mark's gospel, and by showing that it is largely confined to redactional verses have stressed that whether he derived his picture of Jesus from the tradition or not, Mark sets out a picture of one who is a διδάσκαλος and whose main activity is διδάσκειν rather than exorcism or any other work. Yet the arguments of those who have tried to show that there is a considerable amount of teaching material in the gospel are not wholly convincing. Not only is there relatively much less teaching in Mark than in the other two gospels, but no satisfactory explanation for this has been offered in terms of Mark's selection of his material from a larger body of teaching. The only answer which can in any way accord with the facts as they have been set out here is the unproved assertion that Mark possessed no other sayings of Jesus than those he included in his gospel, and even this is far from a complete answer since it would still be open to enquire why Mark should have chosen to stress that Jesus was a teacher when the tradition which came to him contained so little teaching. Perhaps this suggests that the evidence has been misunderstood.

### I. The Terminology

(a) ῥαββι, ῥαββου, διδάσκαλος

Transliterated Aramaic terms are characteristic of Mark. ῥαββι and ῥαββου are found four times (9:5; 10:51; 11:21; 14:45; elsewhere only in Mt 26:25, 49 and in John) and there is little difference in meaning between the two forms<sup>(39)</sup>. John



translates both words by διδασκαλος (Jn 1:38; 20:16), and it seems likely that Mark regarded this as the Greek equivalent. Thus it has become usual to treat the three words together as being semantically identical, and the Jerusalem ossuary discovered by Sukenik, which has διδασκαλος as the title of a Jewish teacher of the law, is frequently cited<sup>(40)</sup>. For Meye it is not clear why Mark preserved the Aramaic word, since there is nothing peculiar about its meaning in this gospel, and he not only treats רַבִּי as the equivalent of διδασκαλος but presses the full didactic sense for both words. In his opinion, Mark retained the title διδασκαλος rather than followed the path taken by Matthew and Luke of substituting κυριος or ἐπιστατης because he was more satisfied than they were to depict Jesus as a teacher<sup>(41)</sup>.

It is doubtful whether this is correct. It should first be noted that רַבִּי is never used by Mark in situations where Jesus is teaching. Peter addresses Jesus in this way at the Transfiguration (9:5) and when he observes that the fig tree has withered (11:21); it is Judas' mode of address in Gethsemane (14:45), and Bartimaeus addresses Jesus as רַבִּי after he has called to him as 'Son of David'. It is not surprising, therefore, that when Matthew and Luke translate the Aramaic word in their versions of the Markan pericopae, they render it by κυριε (Mt 17:4; 20:33; Lk 18:41) or by ἐπιστατα (Lk 9:33)<sup>(42)</sup>. Even if it is claimed that Jesus acted like a rabbi who had a group of disciples<sup>(43)</sup>, in three, if not all four of these incidents, Jesus is going beyond the customs of the rabbis.

It now seems to be generally agreed that the meaning of the word רַבִּי developed from the literal 'my great one', and that it was used as a respectful term of address to anyone of higher rank than the speaker, although with the high esteem in which teachers of the law were regarded it tended to be used especially of these. רַבִּי ( רַבִּי ) is used only of God, except in the Targums. The Samaritans addressed God as רַבִּי. From the first Christian century רַבִּי was normally reserved for ordained teachers of the law and it increasingly lost its first person pronominal significance, being used as a general title. Jeremias says that in the New Testament period the term was in transition and was still used as a polite form of address without being restricted



to the scribes. Rengstorff even quotes a rabbi, who lived as late as the third century A.D. and who had been the leader of a band of robbers before he became a teacher of the law, as saying, 'There (i.e. among the robbers) they called me rabbi, and here (in the rabbinic school) they call me rabbi'. Further, as Lohmeyer points out, not every teacher was automatically addressed as rabbi, and not only teachers were addressed by the title. Thus the semantic range of רַבִּי and διδάσκαλος overlapped but was by no means identical, so that in New Testament times the title רַבִּי could be rendered in Greek equally suitably by διδάσκαλος, κύριος or ἐπιστάτης, none of these words being an exact equivalent in meaning<sup>(44)</sup>. It is possible that Mark's διδάσκαλος is to be understood as a straight Greek rendering of רַבִּי, which always underlies the Greek term.

This seems to be confirmed by an examination of the Matthaean and Lukan parallels to the verses in Mark. A distinction, however, must first be made between the use of the word as an epithet and as a title. διδάσκαλος is retained in Lk 8:49 (=Mk 5:35; in Matthew the narrative is much abbreviated and the speech is omitted), and in Mt 26:18/Lk 22:11 (=Mk 14:14). Where the word is in the vocative the practice of the two later gospel writers is not absolutely consistent. If a broad distinction is made between teaching contexts and other situations, it is found that the four instances of διδάσκαλε which Matthew retains are all in teaching contexts (Mt 19:16 = Mk 10:17; Mt 22:16 = Mk 12:14; Mt 22:24 = Mk 12:19; Mt 22:36, cf. Mk 12:32) and that he omits the title in one teaching context (Mt 24:1 = Mk 13:1). Of the three non-teaching situations, one is extensively rephrased (Mt 20:20-21 = Mk 10:35-36), while in the other two, the stilling of the storm and the healing of the epileptic boy, Matthew replaces διδάσκαλε by κύριε (Mt 8:25 = Mk 4:38; Mt 17:15 = Mk 9:17). The whole pericope of the strange exorcist, which is difficult to categorize but should probably not be regarded as teaching, (Mk 9:38-41) is omitted. Luke retains διδάσκαλε rather more frequently in both types of context - in six teaching situations (Lk 10:25, cf. Mk 12:28, 32; Lk 18:18 = Mk 10:17; Lk 20:21 = Mk 12:14; Lk 20:28 = Mk 12:19; Lk 20:39, cf. Mk 12:32; Lk 21:7, cf. Mk 13:1) and in one non-teaching pericope (Lk 9:38 = Mk 9:17).



He alters διδασκαλε to ἐπιστατα in the incident of the stilling of the storm (Lk 8:24 = Mk 4:38) and also in the account of the strange exorcist, which is to be included in this category of incidents despite its being generally regarded as a pronouncement story<sup>(45)</sup>, since the narrative is less explicitly concerned with teaching, although it was preserved in the tradition for the sake of the saying at the end (Lk 9:49 = Mk 9:38). The story of the request of the sons of Zebedee is omitted by Luke.

Besides the five examples derived from Mark, Matthew has seven further instances of διδασκαλος . Three are in the actual teaching and do not concern us (Mt 10:24, 25; 23:8), two are epithets (Mt 9:11; 17:24) and the remaining two vocatives are not unambiguously in teaching contexts, although they introduce teaching material (Mt 8:19; 12:38). Apart from Lk 2:46, Luke also has seven additional examples of διδασκαλος . Two are within teaching (Lk 6:40 bis) and the rest are vocatives. One is addressed to John the Baptist (Lk 3:12), one is clearly in a teaching setting (Lk 11:45), but the other three are ambiguous, although leading into teaching (Lk 7:40; 12:13; 19:39). Thus both Matthew and Luke tend to restrict the vocative διδασκαλε to teaching contexts.

It is commonly affirmed that Matthew and Luke prefer the titles κυριος and ἐπιστατης to διδασκαλος because of their higher Christology and because they were more strongly influenced by the usage of the later Christian church. This may be partially true and would certainly explain Luke's frequent reference to Jesus as ὁ κυριος . Even without later Christian overtones, κυριε could adequately represent 'ܡܠܝܚܐ', as Lohmeyer has pointed out<sup>(46)</sup>. Yet the way these two later writers treat Mark's narratives suggests an alternative explanation. It seems probable that Matthew and Luke, with their greater facility in Greek, were aware of the strong didactic and intellectual overtones attaching to διδασκαλος and used it only in situations where they felt it was appropriate, whereas to Mark it was simply a stock translation of 'ܡܠܝܚܐ' and had for him the nuances attached to the Aramaic word.

If this argument is sound, it means that the frequent occurrence of διδασκαλος in Mark's gospel cannot in itself be



offered as evidence of his desire to present Jesus primarily as a teacher. Far from treating ῥαββι and διδάσκαλος together as examples of Jesus being addressed as 'Teacher', we must recognize the distinctive range of meanings of the two words and, as it were, stand Meye's argument on its head by claiming that διδάσκαλος for Mark primarily has the semantic range of 'רַבִּי'. This is supported by the fact that κύριε in Mark is found only on the lips of the Syro-Phoenician woman living outside Palestine (7:28). Perhaps Mark felt that this strongly hellensitic form of address, which could be used as a translation of 'רַבִּי', was appropriate only on the lips of a Gentile who would not be aware of the Jewish overtones attached to διδάσκαλος.<sup>(47)</sup> This claim that Mark always meant 'רַבִּי' when he used the word διδάσκαλος must not be understood to mean that Mark was describing Jesus as a rabbi. Indeed, we are trying to show that this is precisely not what Mark intended, at least not in any narrow sense. To Mark διδάσκαλος = 'רַבִּי' was essentially an honorific title<sup>(48)</sup>.

This argument can be sustained, however, only if it can be shown that Mark's use of the other 'teaching' words, διδάσκειν and διδάχη lack the didactic thrust which Meye claims, and these will now be considered.

#### (b) διδάσκειν and διδάχη

Both these words not only occur more frequently in Mark than in the other gospels<sup>(49)</sup>, but the fact that they are found predominantly in redactional passages<sup>(50)</sup> shows that they express a characteristic theme of this evangelist. The writers of the two later gospels alter or omit both words even more frequently than they do διδάσκαλος. Matthew retains διδάσκειν in its Markan context only in Mt 9:35 (= Mk 6:6), Mt 13:54 (= Mk 6:2), Mt 22:16 (= Mk 12:14) and Mt 26:55 (= Mk 14:49). Strikingly he moves Mk 1:22 to express the reaction of the crowds to the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 7:28-29) and transfers Mk 11:18, which forms the conclusion of the cleansing of the temple in Mark, to follow the debate with the Sadducees concerning the resurrection (Mt 22:33), thus linking these statements with accounts of Jesus' teaching. Luke retains διδάσκειν and διδάχη only in Lk 4:31-32 (= Mk 1:21-22)



and in the statement by the opponents of Jesus in Lk 20:21 (= Mk 12:14). Both gospel writers either omit or rephrase all the other examples of both words in Mark. Of special importance is the fact that Luke replaces  $\tauὸ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron;$   $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta \kappa\alpha\tau' \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu$  by  $\tau\iota\varsigma \delta' \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma, \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\iota \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota$ , thus transferring the reference to the words of exorcism (Lk 4:36 = Mk 1:27).

These redactional alterations of Mark's narrative by Matthew and Luke must be set against their wider use of the two words. Matthew has eight additional cases of  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ , but four of these occur within teaching or in narratives about persons other than Jesus (Mt 5:19 bis; 28:15, 20). Mt 5:2 introduces the Sermon on the Mount, Mt 4:23 is part of a summary of all the various activities of Jesus, and teaching is joined to preaching in Mt 11:1. Matthew agrees with Luke in adding a reference to teaching in the temple to the account of the dispute about authority (Mt 21:23, cf. Lk 20:1), possibly to give an antecedent for  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ , because they interpreted 'these things' as teaching<sup>(51)</sup>. The evidence from Matthew, therefore, supports our previous conclusion that he interpreted the  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  words in a strongly didactic sense and had a strong tendency to restrict them to incidents where specific teaching was given or where there was a clear reference to teaching. By contrast Luke adds eleven references to Jesus as teaching, together with four occasions of  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  in other contexts, and the majority of these references are in summaries or introductions (Lk 4:15; 13:10; 13:22; 19:47; 21:37) or in expansions of Markan passages (Lk 5:17, cf. Mk 2:1; Lk 6:6, cf. Mk 3:1; Lk 20:1, cf. Mk 11:27; Lk 20:21, cf. Mk 12:14). Only Lk 5:3 and 23:5 seem to have come from the tradition. It might appear, therefore, that the Lukan usage is similar to Mark's, and it then becomes puzzling why Luke should have omitted or altered so many of the Markan passages which have been examined. Part of the answer is probably that Luke always says that Jesus was teaching or preaching whenever he is described as being in a synagogue (Lk 4:15, 16, 31, 44; 6:6; 13:10; contrast Mk 3:1)<sup>(52)</sup>.

One of the many curious features about Mark's use of the teaching vocabulary is that he introduces teaching by  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  comparatively rarely, although it is true that he does this more frequently than Matthew or Luke<sup>(53)</sup>. The only sayings which are prefaced by  $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  words are the parables in chapter 4, the



first two predictions of the passion (8:31; 9:31), the quotation of Isaiah 58 and Jeremiah 7 at the cleansing of the temple (11:17) and the saying about David's son (12:35). Only in 8:31 does διδάσκειν introduce the saying directly; in the other passages ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς) is added, but this may well be simply a feature of Mark's style, corresponding to the Hebrew דָּרַשׁ . A second peculiarity is that, except for the predictions of the passion, the audience is always the crowd, either in the synagogue or in the open. The second of these will be discussed first, since it determines the answer to the question whether Mark thought of Jesus as a rabbi surrounded by a band of disciples, and it also influences the interpretation of the way in which Mark understood the teaching of Jesus.

Comparatively little study has been made of the audiences to which Jesus addressed his sayings. T.W. Manson made some attempt at this in his examination of the teaching of Jesus<sup>(54)</sup>, A.W. Mosley considered Jesus' audiences in Mark and Luke<sup>(55)</sup>, J.A. Baird has conducted a detailed study of all the sayings in the synoptic gospels from this point of view<sup>(56)</sup>, and P.S. Minear has compared the references to the audiences in the three synoptic gospels<sup>(57)</sup>. For the present purpose Minear's work is the most useful of these, since the other writers are concerned to show that Jesus adapted his way of speaking to his audience or use the approach to elicit information about the reliability of the gospel records<sup>(58)</sup>.

A preliminary problem is to decide what groups of listeners Mark had in mind when he wrote about Jesus' audiences. Some are fairly clearly defined: the Twelve<sup>(59)</sup>, the scribes<sup>(60)</sup>, Pharisees and Sadducees<sup>(61)</sup>, and chief priests<sup>(62)</sup>. Difficulty, however, arises when Mark's use of μαθηταὶ and ὄχλος is considered. A common picture in the minds of those who read the gospels is that Jesus moved around Palestine, mainly in the Galilee area, surrounded by vast crowds, many of whom became his disciples, and it was from this larger group of disciples that he selected twelve to be an inner circle of close followers. This is certainly the picture which Luke presents (cf. the call of the Twelve in Lk 6:13 and the mission of the Seventy in Lk 10:1), but it is far from certain that it was the view of Mark. Meye, indeed, argues that



in this gospel the Twelve are the only disciples and that Mark identifies 'Twelviship' and 'discipleship',<sup>(63)</sup>.

Mark, like the other gospel writers, never speaks of the 'disciples of Jesus', although he mentions the 'disciples of John' and the 'disciples of the Pharisees' (2:18), and he never uses μαθητης without the article. His usual phrase is οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (31 times)<sup>(64)</sup>, with which may be combined οἱ μαθηταὶ μου (14:14) and οἱ σοὶ μαθηταὶ (2:18), οἱ μαθηταὶ σου (7:5; 9:18). οἱ μαθηταὶ without any possessive pronoun occurs six times (6:41; 9:14; 10:10, 13, 24; 14:16), but there appears to be no special significance in the term. There is in addition the unique phrase οἱ ἰδῶν μαθηταὶ in 4:34. A full study of Mark's understanding of discipleship would involve examining two other phrases found in his gospel, οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ (4:10, cf. 3:34) and οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ (3:14; 5:40; cf. 5:18; 14:67), and the verb ἀκολουθεῖν (1:18; 2:14-15; 3:7; 5:24; 6:1; 8:34; 9:38; 10:21, 28, 32, 52; 15:41; cf. 11:9) as well as μαθητης. Since the present aim is simply to identify the audiences of Jesus, these words will be considered only in their contexts.

One difficulty in deciding to which group οἱ μαθηταὶ refers lies in the fact that Mark seldom brings the term into any relationship with the δωδεκα<sup>(65)</sup>. It can, however, be inferred that οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ) refers to the Twelve alone in 6:35, 41, 45 (cf. 6:7, 12-13, 30-31) and in 14:12, 13, 14, 16, 32 (cf. 14:17). Probably 11:1 with its precise reference to two of his disciples also applies to the Twelve (cf. 14:13). Apart from 4:10 and the six references before the appointment of the Twelve, all the other instances are ambiguous in the sense that it is possible to understand the narratives intelligibly whether οἱ μαθηταὶ (αὐτοῦ) is interpreted as the Twelve or as a wider group of disciples. It is possible to argue that where a smaller group of individual disciples are named in the immediate context a presumption exists that the μαθηταὶ are the Twelve (e.g. 5:31, cf. 5:37; 8:27, 33-34, cf. 8:29, 32-33; 11:14, cf. 11:21). Since the last prediction of the passion is given to the Twelve, and there is some reason to suppose that the first is similarly restricted, it is probable that the μαθηταὶ in 9:31 also means the Twelve (cf. also 9:30 'he would that no man should know it')<sup>(66)</sup>, and possibly also where conditions



seem to restrict the number of the disciples, as when they are all in a house (7:17; 9:28, and hence 9:14, 18; 10:10) or in a boat (8:10, and hence 8:1, 4, 6), although the restricted number of disciples need not consist of the Twelve, or even be the same group of disciples on each occasion. Even so (and the arguments above are not strong) there remain about ten instances of μαθηται which remain ambiguous, and it is necessary to examine any evidence which might indicate that Mark envisaged a circle of disciples wider than the Twelve.

At first sight it might appear that none of the six references to the μαθηται before the appointment of the Twelve can apply to this special group since it had not yet been formed. To assert this, however, would be to confuse historical fact with Mark's use of his vocabulary<sup>(67)</sup>. It might be that instead of envisaging a wider circle of disciples from whom the Twelve were chosen, Mark consistently identified the μαθηται with the δωδεκα and so intended to point to the incipient group of the Twelve, those followers of Jesus who would later become members of the Twelve, when he used the former term. It should be noted that he does not introduce the term until after Simon, Andrew, James and John have been called and have responded to that call. Not only do three of these form an inner circle within the Twelve (see 5:37; 9:2) but all four receive the secret teaching in chapter 13. There is no difficulty in interpreting 2:18, 23 and 3:7, 9 as referring to the four disciples whose call Mark has recounted<sup>(68)</sup>. Thus only two questions remain: does not Mark recount the call of Levi as if he were one of the Twelve (2:13-14), although Levi is not included in the list in 3:16-19, and does not 2:15 explicitly state that there were 'many' disciples who followed Jesus?

As to the call of Levi, the problems involved are well-known and have been much discussed. The similarities with the call of the first four disciples suggest that this is an account of the call of a member of the Twelve. This may be supported by the early interpretation seen in Mt 9:9 and the Western text of Mark noted below. Also Levi is mentioned only here and in the Lukan parallel passage (Lk 5:27, 29), and only Mark says that he was the son of Alphaeus. Matthew gives the disciple's name as Matthew.



Further Matthew and James the son of Alphaeus are included in Mark's list of the Twelve, but no mention is made of Levi, and certain Western, Caesarean and Syrian MSS replace Levi by James the son of Alphaeus in Mk 2:14.

All of the attempted explanations of these facts involve some unjustified assumptions or a too great willingness to accept harmonizing changes in the text, such as that Levi and Matthew were two names for the same person (but Mark gives no indication of this), that James and Levi are names for the same disciple (a sheer conjecture), or that the true Markan text is that of Codex D and other MSS (but this reading looks like a later attempt to solve the problem and it fails to explain how Levi entered Luke, even if it is assumed that the name here is due to assimilation). It is also suggested that by the time Mark wrote there was uncertainty about the names of some of the Twelve and he included two divergent traditions (but this solution involves either inconsistency on the part of Mark or his holding that Levi was not one of the Twelve). If it is simply stated that <sup>Mark</sup>included the call of a disciple who was not one of the Twelve, no explanation is usually given of why Levi should be specially singled out<sup>(69)</sup>, or why there are such close parallels with the previous call of the 'four', or even why the early interpretations of Mark which have been noted above should have been made<sup>(70)</sup>. No satisfactory solution of this difficulty has been produced. The most probable answer is that Mark was using inconsistent traditions, but this means that we cannot always demand consistency in the gospel<sup>(71)</sup>.

As to Mk 2:15-16, although there are slightly different readings in some important MSS, the central issue is, to whom does the clause 'for there were many, and they followed him' refer? There appear to be three possibilities: (i) the whole clause is a parenthesis, probably with semitic parataxis, explaining τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ('for there were now many (disciples) who followed him'), and showing Mark's awareness that so far he had mentioned only five disciples and that he needed to point out that there were more than these<sup>(72)</sup>; (ii) the clause refers to the subject of the previous sentence, the 'publicans and sinners',<sup>(73)</sup>; (iii) the clause should be divided and a break made after πολλοί, so that it is the publicans and sinners who



are many and the scribes who followed Jesus<sup>(74)</sup>. The last suggestion is unlikely because it involves inserting *καὶ* before *ἰδόντες* in v.16 with *ⲭⲚⲔ 33* Lat<sup>b</sup> and it seems forced to translate *ἠκολούθησαν* as 'followed him (into the house)'. Grammatically it is equally possible for the clause to refer to the disciples or to the publicans and sinners, and since there have been no adequate arguments put forward for linking it with 'disciples' and it would provide an explanation why there were many of the social outcasts at the banquet, it is best to adopt the second interpretation. Even if it is claimed that *ἠκολούθειν* often means to follow Jesus literally, accompanying him in his travels (cf. 1:18; 2:14, 15; 8:34) this does not prove that Mark used *ἠκολούθειν* as a technical term for being a *μαθητής* <sup>(75)</sup>. It is not intended to show that no more than the Twelve 'followed' Jesus, but only that by the *μαθηταί* Mark means the Twelve.

Thus, while no proof can be offered that all the references to the *μαθηταί* in chapters 2 and 3 refer to the small group of disciples who would later be included in the number of the Twelve, this is by no means impossible, and it must be accepted that the mention of the disciples here is ambiguous rather than a clear proof that Mark believed that there was a large group of *μαθηταί* of whom the Twelve formed a small inner circle.

Only one other passage need be discussed. It is frequently stated that 3:13-14 means that Jesus selected the Twelve from a larger group of disciples<sup>(76)</sup>. This is a good example of the way in which an over-hasty concern with historical events has led to an unrecognized harmonizing of the Markan with the Lukan account of this incident, and it is important that attention should be concentrated on Mark's own statement. Luke, who held that there was a large group of *μαθηταί*, explicitly states that Jesus summoned this wider group and selected the Twelve from them, but as Cranfield points out, in Mark's version it is not clear whether those who were 'called' were simply the Twelve or a larger company from whom the Twelve were then chosen<sup>(77)</sup>. The issue is fairly simple: is *καὶ ἐποίησεν δωδεκά* parallel to *καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἠθέλην αὐτός* or does it describe a subsequent action by Jesus? It is generally agreed that the awkward *ἐποίησεν* is a semitism derived from the use of the verb



in the LXX (e.g. 1 Sam 12:6; 1 Kin 12:31, where it translates  $\text{נִשְׁמָר}$ ) and that it means 'appointed'. It certainly contains no thought of selection, and Luke changes it to  $\text{ἐκλεξαμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν}$ . The  $\text{καί}$  before  $\text{ἐποίησεν}$  can well be akin to the semitic explanatory 'and' <sup>(78)</sup>, and this interpretation is supported by the emphatic  $\text{οὗς ἤθελεν αὐτοὺς}$  with  $\text{προσκαλεῖται}$ . It is the Twelve who are summoned and appointed for their special position and duties <sup>(79)</sup>. Even if the interpretation of the majority of commentators is correct and Mark means that the Twelve were selected from a larger group, it is to be noted that Mark does not call these others  $\text{μαθηταί}$  <sup>(80)</sup>.

The results of this survey of Mark's use of  $\text{μαθηταί}$  are as follows: in eight places  $\text{οἱ μαθηταί}$  ( $\text{αὐτοῦ, μου, σου}$ ) clearly refers to the Twelve; on seventeen further occasions the title probably means the Twelve; and although the remaining sixteen occurrences of the term (excluding 14:4 and 16:7) are ambiguous, none of them need apply to a larger number than the Twelve or than those who would later be included in that group when it was formed. On the basis of this, in the later discussion of the audience to which Jesus addressed his teaching we shall assume that by  $\text{οἱ μαθηταί}$  ( $\text{αὐτοῦ, μου, σου, σου}$ ) Mark means the Twelve <sup>(81)</sup>.

The final group of passages to be considered are those containing the word  $\text{ὄχλος}$ , together with  $\text{πληθος}$  and  $\text{λαος}$ . Baird divides the allusions to the crowd into two categories according to their reaction to Jesus' teaching. He maintains that there were no neutral persons in the audiences but that the people were either for Jesus or against him, and he attempts to distinguish between a disciple crowd (DG) and an opponent crowd (GO), admitting that this is difficult to carry through, partly because the gospel writers did not develop a set of categories to distinguish the opponent crowd and partly because their use of the terms is not consistent <sup>(82)</sup>. This is of little importance for the study of Mark because the only Markan passages which Baird discusses are 1:21-28 (where the audience is not called  $\text{ὄχλος}$ , and only a relatively small synagogue is referred to), 6:2 ( $\text{πολλοί}$ , but again a synagogue congregation, and the true reading may be  $\text{οἱ πολλοί}$  = 'the majority' or 'all who were present') <sup>(83)</sup>, and 15:29-30, 35-36 (not  $\text{ὄχλος}$ ). Of the logia which he lists, only



6:4 and 15:34 are assigned to the opponent crowd<sup>(84)</sup>. As in the discussion of *μᾶθηταις*, it is important to restrict attention to Mark's usage and not to attempt an historical reconstruction of the 'actual events'.

The crowd is an integral feature in a number of pericopae - the healing of the paralytic (2:4), the statement about Jesus' true family (3:32), the woman with the haemorrhage (5:27, 30-31), the two feeding miracles (6:34, 45; 8:1, 2, 6 - but the introductions may be redactional) - and is mentioned by the tradition in one or two other places, e.g. 7:33 where Jesus took the deaf mute aside from the crowd (cf. the healing of the blind man in 8:23), 9:25 where a crowd runs to see the epileptic boy (but note the inconsistency with 9:14-15), 12:41, the crowd which asked for the release of Barabbas, and possibly 11:32 and 14:2 which tell of the Jewish leaders' fear of the crowd. (14:43 is from the tradition but is hardly relevant.) In these narratives the crowd is generally friendly towards Jesus, but seems to regard him as a wonder-worker. Apart perhaps from the difficult passage in 3:31-35, which will be discussed later, there is no suggestion that the crowd is at all committed to discipleship.

The picture of the crowd in the redactional verses is slightly different. They still throng to Jesus (e.g. 2:13; 3:7-9, 19b-20; 4:1; 5:21; 6:31-34), but they are depicted rather more clearly as followers who may have come because of the miracles (3:8), but who remain to listen to his teaching (2:13; 4:1; 6:34; 10:1). On two occasions Jesus specifically calls the crowd to him in order to give them teaching (7:14; 8:34). It is not clear whether Mark envisaged any distinction between the crowds in Galilee and in Jerusalem<sup>(85)</sup>, although it has to be noted that it is only the Jerusalem crowds who are reported to be astonished at the teaching of Jesus and to have listened to him eagerly (11:18; 12:37; but cf. 1:27-28). They are, nevertheless, not described as being even close adherents of Jesus; rather they are a fairly volatile mob who are attracted to the new teacher and wonder-worker<sup>(86)</sup>. Mark frequently emphasizes that they are a 'great' crowd (*πᾶς* 2:13; 4:1; 9:15; 11:18; *πλεῖστος* 4:1; *ἱκανὸς* 10:46; *πολύς* 3:7, 8; 5:21, 24; 8:1; 9:14; 12:37 - all probably redactional), and this is in accord



with the overall impression given. The ὄχλος is always in the open air or in the temple courts<sup>(87)</sup>.

Besides these main terms used by Mark to indicate different groups to whom Jesus addressed his teaching are found three prepositional phrases, οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν (4:10, cf. 3:34), οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ (5:40, cf. 3:14; 5:18; 14:67, and, with reference to Peter, 1:36), and οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ (3:21). It will be convenient to discuss such of these as are relevant in the course of examining the audiences to whom Jesus' teaching is directed.

After this necessary consideration of the ways in which Mark designates the various audiences of Jesus, we can return to discuss his use of διδάσκειν and διδαχῇ. In only two cases is the audience of Jesus' 'teaching' the Twelve (8:31; 9:31 - the μαθηταὶ are directly specified in 9:31 and can be inferred for 8:31 from 8:27). The ὄχλος is specified in 2:13; 4:1-2; 6:34; 10:1, and can be inferred for 12:35 from 12:37. In 11:17 those who listen to the teaching are the chief priests, the scribes and the ὄχλος (11:18). Since 1:21-27 occurs in the synagogue the audience is the congregation on that particular sabbath, and there is a similar congregation in 6:1-2. No audience is specified in 6:6, 'he went round about the villages teaching' (it was presumably the crowd or the synagogue congregations), nor in 14:49, where the reference is to the teaching in the temple which was heard by the Jewish leaders and the crowd. Only one reference is slightly doubtful, 12:38, but since the section 12:35-44 is set in the temple and the πολλὸς ὄχλος is mentioned in v.37, it can be assumed that they are the hearers. Thus Jesus is depicted as giving his teaching mainly to the crowd, either in the open air or in the synagogue or the temple. Very rarely his opponents are also present, but Mark never uses διδάσκειν directly with reference to them, except possibly in 11:17. The significance of this will be seen later.

This examination of the terminology used by Mark has shown that, while he frequently uses ῥαββί and διδάσκαλε as terms of addressing Jesus, they are by no means confined to teaching situations, and it was suggested that the semantic range of meaning attached to the Aramaic ܪܒܝ underlies the Greek διδάσκαλε. It was also found that διδάσκειν and διδαχῇ rarely introduce teaching, and that it is chiefly the crowd who are 'taught'.



It is not possible to discover any immediate semitic background to the Greek words which could explain this, for the dominant meaning of  $\text{פָּתַח}$  and  $\text{הוֹרָה}$  in the Old Testament is 'to make plain, to teach', although there seems to be less intellectual emphasis than in the Greek words.

Two explanations now appear possible. Firstly, it may be that Mark did not understand Jesus primarily as a teacher. He uses  $\text{διδασκαλε}$  as an honorific title, which always has the semantic range of the Aramaic  $\text{רַבִּי}$ , and whenever he uses the verb  $\text{διδασκειν}$  he does not intend the imparting of knowledge or religious truth in any didactic sense, but understands the word in some other way. An alternative interpretation of the facts which have been set out so far is that Mark found the title  $\text{διδασκαλε}$  in his tradition, where it retained the meaning of the Aramaic title  $\text{רַבִּי}$ . He, however, misunderstood this and took it in its Greek, didactic sense. On the basis of this he added his frequent references to Jesus' teaching the crowd. Further, he made an attempt to collect such teaching of Jesus as was preserved in the traditions available to him and included in his gospel all that he could discover. The amount was relatively slight and much of it was obscure. This would account not only for the paucity of the teaching but also for Mark's interpretation of Jesus' practice, that he taught the crowds and explained the teaching to the Twelve.

In order to test these two explanations we must turn to the sayings themselves.

## II. The Sayings

Treating 13:5-37 as a single unit, there are 175 logia in Mark<sup>(88)</sup>. Of these 29 are addressed to individuals or groups in miracle stories and a further 9 sayings which are addressed to the disciples are also in these pericopae. While these sayings occasionally contain important teaching, they are generally concerned with the course of the miracle, and may therefore be disregarded for our purposes<sup>(89)</sup>. Most of the remaining logia can be assigned fairly easily to the audiences discussed above and serious doubts arise with only seven groups of sayings<sup>(90)</sup>. Before proceeding further it is necessary to consider the doubtful



logia.

(a) 1:38. All the commentators agree that *Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτῶν* (v.36) means Peter and the other three disciples who have already been mentioned. It would be unnecessary to delay on this verse were it not for Luke's substitution of *οἱ ὄχλοι*. This shows how important it is to concentrate on the Markan narrative<sup>(91)</sup>.

(b) 2:17, cf. 2:15-16. The 'scribes of the Pharisees' complain to Jesus' disciples about his behaviour. It has already been argued that the disciples are the 'four' at this point. The problem is whether Jesus in his reply is speaking to the scribes or to his disciples. Few commentators discuss the question. Taylor suggests that the complaint was told to Jesus and that he replied to his disciples, while Nineham implies that the reply was to the scribes<sup>(92)</sup>. A decision is difficult. Attempts to solve the difficulty by asking what is feasible historically must be avoided. It was not a concern of Mark whether a parabolic saying used in defence had to be addressed to Jesus' opponents. The narrative is a mere framework for the pronouncement and our purpose is to discover Mark's interpretation of this. If, as seems likely, *ἀκούουσιν* means 'overhearing', the reply is probably directed to the scribes.

(c) 2:19-22. No inner contradiction is involved in accepting the view that all these originally independent sayings were spoken to the same audience (contrast chapter 4), and the problem is simply to identify the subject of *ἐρχονται* and *λέγουσι* in v.18, for these are clearly the *αὐτοὶ* of Jesus' reply. Although Swete follows Lk 5:33 in making the questioners the scribes of 2:16, it is more probable that the verbs are impersonal<sup>(93)</sup>. Mark is more interested in the conflicts with the followers of John the Baptist and the Pharisees and in the replies of Jesus than in the matter of who the questioners are. The questions need not be hostile, although Baird assigns these sayings to an audience of hard core opponents<sup>(94)</sup>.

(d) 3:4. Although all those commentators who consider the question, with the exception of Klostermann<sup>(95)</sup>, agree that the observers are the Pharisees mentioned in v.6, it should be noted that this passage again shows the importance of limiting the attention to the Markan version without even attempting to



apply form critical judgements. Bultmann regards v.6 as an addition to the original pericope where the opponents are not identified.<sup>(96)</sup>

(e) 3:33, 35. Meye argues that Mark continues the scene from vv.19b-20, where Jesus is probably depicted with his disciples in a house so filled with the crowd that they cannot eat. It is this crowd which brings the message to Jesus (v.32) and it is the Twelve seated around him at whom Jesus looks and concerning whom he speaks the saying in vv. 34-35. But Meye admits that Mark's picture is vague and that the saying about those who do God's will need not be restricted to the Twelve and need not be identical with discipleship<sup>(97)</sup>. This raises the important question of how far Mark was master of his material and was able to impose a consistent pattern upon the traditions which came down to him. This cannot be discussed here except to point out that, while due attention must be given to Mark's portrayal of individual incidents, it is dangerous to try to extend the conclusions from these to cover larger complexes. Thus the audience in this passage must be adjudged to be the crowd<sup>(98)</sup>.

(f) 4:1-34. Three problems are presented by these verses: To whom are the constituent sayings addressed? What is meant by the phrase *οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ οὗτοι τοὶ δώδεκα*? What is the relation between vv. 10-12 and 33-34, and who are *οἱ ἰδίαι μὲθοι*? These may be considered in turn.

Chapter 4 contains the beginnings of a collection of Jesus' teaching like those found in several other sections of Mark (2:19-22; 7:6-23; 8:34 - 9:1; 9:39-50; 11:22-25) and which attain a fully developed form in Matthew. Even Matthew and Luke find difficulty in prescribing the audience when they compile such collections<sup>(99)</sup>, so that it is not surprising that Mark's account should show certain inconsistencies. The construction of the chapter has been much discussed<sup>(100)</sup>. There is no need to trace out the possible formation of the chapter here and only the problem of identifying the audience to which the parables and sayings are addressed will be considered.

As is now generally recognized, the chapter contains three parables (vv. 3-9, 26-29, 30-32), an interpretation of the parable of the Sower (vv.13-20), a saying about the purpose of teaching in parables (vv.11-12), a collection of sayings



(vv.21-25, and a redactional introduction and conclusion, both of which stress the way in which Jesus taught in parables (vv.1-2, 33-34). Mark states that the parable of the Sower is told to an ὄχλος πλεοντες (vv.1-2) and that the saying about the mystery of the kingdom, and the interpretation of the Sower were spoken to οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ συν τοῖς δώδεκα when Jesus was alone. No other indication of audience is given, but in vv.35-36 Jesus is still in the boat and the implication of v.33 is that at least the parables of the Seed Growing Secretly and the Mustard Seed were spoken to the crowd. If Mark regarded the short logia in vv. 21-25 as parables (and his understanding of παραβολή will be considered later) it is probable that he intended the narrative to revert to the crowd scene at v.21, although he does not state this explicitly. The chapter would then display Mark's favourite device of incorporating one incident within another (cf. 5:21-43; 6:7-31; 11:12-25, and perhaps also 3:19b-35; 8:27 - 9:13)<sup>(101)</sup>.

Two main types of interpretation of the phrase οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ συν τοῖς δώδεκα are offered. Some see the presence of two phrases both designating an inner circle of Jesus' followers as the result of the way the chapter was compiled, so that either two readings have been conflated<sup>(102)</sup>, or that 'with the Twelve' was added by Mark to his source<sup>(103)</sup>. Others explain the phrase as denoting a larger group of disciples among whom were the Twelve<sup>(104)</sup>. Against these explanations Meye argues that the phrase means, 'Those about him who belonged to the company of the Twelve'. His arguments are as follows: (i) Mark states that Jesus is alone (κατα μόνος). Elsewhere Jesus is alone with the Twelve (6:31-32), with Peter, James and John (9:2), or with these three disciples plus Andrew (13:3). Meye claims that 7:33, the incident of the deaf mute, and 9:28, οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, are not equally explicit, but seem to fall in line with the other passages. Thus 4:10 is likely to be a similar scene with the Twelve unless specific exegesis forbids it. (ii) Mark states that Jesus expounded the parables to his own disciples (4:34) and these must be the Twelve. This is parallel to the scene here. (iii) οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ describes someone's company or entourage and the exact identity of the group must be decided by the context or other knowledge. In Mark's gospel one naturally assumes that it is the Twelve. (iv) συν with the dative denotes accompaniment



or association. Mk 2:26 and Lk 24:24 show that the preposition can be used to link part of a body of people with the whole group. Thus by adding *σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα* Mark simply wishes to state that those about Jesus belonged to the company of the Twelve. Meye further compares chapters 4 and 13, both of which comprise an extended discourse by Jesus containing references to parables and have the setting of Jesus 'alone', and he wonders whether Mark thought of *οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ* as Peter, James, John and Andrew, the first four disciples called by Jesus.

Meye's comment on Mark's use of *κατὰ μόναν*, *κατ' ἑκάστην* may be accepted with certain reservations, for 7:33 shows that Mark does not use either term in a technical sense for private teaching given to the Twelve or to a smaller group chosen from among them. Moreover, while 4:34 may justifiably be used to explicate 4:10, *οἱ ἰδίοι μαθηταί* is a unique phrase and is not entirely unambiguous, even though the *μαθηταί* are probably interpreted by Mark as the Twelve. With regard to Meye's fourth point, *σὺν* is a relatively rare preposition in the New Testament apart from the Lukan writings and occurs only six times in Mark<sup>(105)</sup>, none of which can bear the sense which Meye tries to find here (cf. 8:34 which provides the nearest parallel to the grammatical phrase, where the Twelve are clearly distinguished from the crowd). Mk 2:26 and Lk 24:24 which Meye quotes to support his argument have no bearing on the point, since the phrase *οἱ σὺν* is a different construction and always refers to a group which accompanies an individual or another group<sup>(106)</sup>. Thus even if the article with *περὶ αὐτοῦ* were carried forward to include *σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα* it would mean that there was a group in addition to the Twelve. *Οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ* cannot be a sub-group of the Twelve and *σὺν* is an unnatural way of expressing *id est*. Thus what Mark has written in this verse would seem to be saying that Jesus explained the meaning of the use of parables to the Twelve and a group of his adherents from the crowd. It is to be noted that these followers are not called *μαθηταί*, perhaps additional evidence for Mark's restricting of this term to the Twelve. This is not quite all that must be said, but first vv.33-34 must be considered.

It has already been argued that by *οἱ μαθηταί* Mark means the Twelve, and indeed most commentators assume either that *οἱ ἰδίοι μαθηταί* are the Twelve or those mentioned in v.10. Meye



asks whose Jesus' own disciples can be if they are not the Twelve. Many hold that v.34 is Markan<sup>(107)</sup>, but if this is so an explanation of the unique phrase 'his own disciples' is needed. The verse may well come from the tradition<sup>(108)</sup>. It is probable that Mark interpreted vv.10 and 33-34 in the same way. If those scholars are right who suggest that Mark added 'with the Twelve' in v.10, the facts may have been these: v.34 expresses Mark's view that Jesus explained his teaching to the Twelve; the tradition which came to him stated that it was οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ who asked for and received this explanation; and in order to make it plain that the Twelve were never excluded from this secret teaching Mark added a reference to them in v.10.

An examination of the sayings in relation to the audiences to which they are addressed reveals that Mark restricts his use of διδάσκειν/διδάχη to a crowd audience with the exception of 8:31 and 9:31, yet a large majority of the sayings are addressed to the disciples (disciples 71, even when 13:5-37 is counted as one saying, the crowd 18, opponents 19, or 17 if the scribe to whom Jesus spoke 12:29-31, 34 is regarded as a friendly individual). There are four main sections of teaching addressed to the crowd, 4:3-9 + 21-32; 7:14-15; 8:34 - 9:1; 12:35-40, and Mark draws attention to these by his use of διδάσκειν in 4:1-2 and 12:35 and of διδάχη in 4:2 and 12:38, and by stating that Jesus specially summoned the crowd in 7:14 and 8:34<sup>(109)</sup>. The remaining sayings addressed to the crowd are so short and form such an integral part of the pericopae in which they are found that they hardly constitute bodies of teaching, and the use of διδάσκειν and διδάχη in 6:2 and 11:17-18 should perhaps be included among those instances where no teaching is given. Thus according to Mark's account, Jesus is presented as 'teaching' the crowd rather than his disciples, yet only four groups of sayings are addressed to the crowd, although these are introduced with considerable emphasis upon the fact that Jesus is engaged in the activity of teaching<sup>(110)</sup>. To account for this we must consider how Mark understood Jesus' methods of teaching.

The most important passage for this is 4:1-34. Several of the theories which have been put forward to explain how this chapter reached its present form have already been noted<sup>(111)</sup>.



These are often based on linguistic tests and on logical inconsistencies between different parts of the chapter, and usually those who have analyzed the chapter have been primarily concerned to sift out which sayings can be regarded as authentic words of Jesus and what their original meaning was. When the teaching of later strata in the tradition and that of Mark himself is considered, attention is usually concentrated upon isolated verses. Thus the majority of recent studies claim that vv. 11-12 and 34 contain 'Mark's view of Jesus' parabolic teaching, although the writers differ in their ideas about the origin of the sayings, which are variously ascribed to Jesus himself (in an Aramaic form)<sup>(112)</sup>, to the early church<sup>(113)</sup>, and to Mark<sup>(114)</sup>.

This represents much patient analysis of the chapter and microscopic attention to detail, but it must be recognized nonetheless that the chapter as we have it is in the form in which Mark wrote it and that, while there may be some inconsistencies within it, these cannot have appeared to Mark as gross contradictions. It is wrong, therefore, to limit Mark's explanation of Jesus' methods to one or two verses and equally wrong to apply to the interpretation of Mark's thought a method which has been of great value in analyzing the chapter.

Thus it has become common to see in 4:11-12; 4:13-20 + 4:34; and 4:33 three different and inconsistent interpretations of the purpose of Jesus' parables as follows.<sup>(115)</sup> According to 4:11-12 the parables were directly intended to prevent the crowds from understanding the 'mystery of the kingdom of God' which was 'given', according to v.10, only to 'those who were about (Jesus) with the Twelve'. Boers, following Jülicher, pushes this to its full extent, pointing out that the verses do not say that to those outside Jesus' teaching come in parables without added interpretations. Parables were the method used to hide the mystery of the kingdom from the crowds and were intended solely for this purpose; the mystery was given to the disciples in some other way<sup>(116)</sup>. According to 4:13-20, 34 the parables are really allegories which cannot be understood until the key has been given. This key consisted of the explanations which Jesus gave privately to his disciples. According to 4:33 Jesus taught the crowds by means of parables because they needed these stories to overcome their limited ability to understand.



Most commentators stop at this point, contenting themselves with discussing why these divergent interpretations were put forward and considering what was Jesus' own purpose in using parables. Boers, however, realizes that some explanation of the present text of Mark is required. He argues that Mark's own view was that the parables were allegories, as is shown from the fact that they are 'frequently' interpreted in his gospel, and that the disciples are reprimanded because they did not understand the allegorical meaning of the parables (4:13c)<sup>(117)</sup>. Thus Mark had to reconcile the view expressed in vv.11-12 with this, and he attempted to do so by saying in v.34a that Jesus told the 'parables' (meaning the intentionally obscure sayings of v.11), but solved them in private for the disciples (v.34b). In fact, Boers claims, he did not remove the contradiction but only interpreted the contrast in v.11 between the parables which were intended to prevent those outside from understanding the meaning of Jesus and the mystery of the kingdom of God which was communicated directly to the disciples in another way as expressing the double purpose of the parables/allegories which have to be explained to be understood<sup>(118)</sup>. Boers states, finally, that Mark apparently failed to notice that v.34a as he now intended it contradicted 33b where it is stated that the parables were told in order to help the hearers to understand the message, although he probably thought that he had achieved agreement between the traditions in vv.11-12, 13-20 and 33 by his statement in v.34<sup>(119)</sup>.

In leaving an unresolved contradiction Boers has to argue that Mark was a less skilful editor than Matthew, who rewrites his source in order to remove the inconsistencies which he found there. May not the explanation of the Matthaean redaction be the Matthew understood Mark in a similar way to that of Boers and therefore felt compelled to introduce the changes which he did, but that Mark put a different construction upon his narrative? This would be in line with the way in which both Matthew and Luke understood διδακτικός solely in a didactic sense, which may not accord with Mark's intentions.

The solution would thus lie partly in seeing how Mark understood παραβολή and the statement in v.33b, and partly in correctly analyzing v.11. The wide range of meaning attached to the Hebrew



ܠܫܢܐ and the Aramaic ܠܫܢܐ has frequently been noted and it has been claimed that Mark introduced vv.11-12 at this point because he was misled by confusing the two senses of 'obscure saying, enigma' and 'parable' as a story<sup>(120)</sup>. If, however, all the occasions when parable occurs in Mark are examined it will be found that Mark applies the word to story parables only in this chapter and in 12:1, 12. In 3:23 and 13:28 similes and other sayings are given the title, while in 7:17 parable is applied to what appears to be straightforward teaching. It is a characteristic of the use of words with a range of meaning that the different nuances are not sharply distinguished by unreflective persons speaking their native language<sup>(121)</sup>. Mark, who appears to have been more at home with Aramaic than Greek<sup>(122)</sup>, may not have noticed that he was using παραβολη in slightly different senses and would easily slip from one meaning to another. In fact his dominant understanding of the word seems to have been 'dark saying'. Thus for Mark παραβολη was not primarily an allegory which needed an interpretation but an obscure saying which was difficult to understand. He evidently considered that the primary way in which the disciples attained an understanding of these παραβολαι was through the explanations which Jesus gave, but he also held that the disciples should have understood the meanings without this (cf. 8:14-21). This would account for the question in v.13 and also provide one explanation for his stress upon their failure to understand, which has been linked since Wrede with the idea of the messianic secret<sup>(123)</sup>.

This is itself sufficient to explain why Mark saw no contradiction between vv. 11-12 and 34. There is, however, an additional factor which facilitated the inclusion of both statements still further. We have seen that Boers claimed that there is a contrast in v.11 between the parables which are told to the crowd to prevent them from understanding Jesus' message, and the mystery which is given to the disciples in some other way. Although he is highly critical of Jeremias' arguments<sup>(124)</sup>, he largely accepts Jeremias' view that the parallelism in the two halves of the verse makes παραβολαι the antithesis of μυστηριον. But as Baird has demonstrated<sup>(125)</sup> the true parallelism is:



audience	ὑμῖν	ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω
content	το μυστηριον της βασιλειας του θεου	τα παντα
method	δεδοται	γινεται
form	—	ἐν παραβολαις

Baird says that 'in parables' applies to the form in which the teaching is given and the mystery to the content, and he explicates the method by which the mystery of the kingdom of God is given to the disciples as 'by Jesus' direct explanation'. This is not entirely certain. It is possible that in the tradition divinely given insight was intended. To fit Baird's argument the strict parallel to 'in parables' should be 'in parables plus interpretation', the precise meaning which Jülicher and Boers so strongly oppose. Mark, however, may well have accepted this sense and thus there would be no contradiction between his understanding of vv.11-12 and 34, but instead the two passages would be identical in meaning.

Even if Mark interpreted the form in which the mystery was granted to the disciples as divine insight, he might still have seen no inconsistency in his completed chapter. Everything would then come in parables to those outside because they lack this insight which the disciples possess. It is important to remember that to Mark παραβολη was probably imbued with the whole range of meaning attached to  $\text{בְּמִשְׁלָּה} / \text{מִשְׁלָּה}$ . Thus not only 'parables' but any teaching of Jesus, indeed beyond the spoken word, 'all things', the whole activity of Jesus, are 'riddles' to those who have not received the divine understanding. This understanding is mediated to the chosen disciples partly through the explanations which Jesus gives - explanations which are needed not only for the parables (allegories) but for the other teaching of Jesus (cf. 7:18-23) and even the actions of Jesus as well (cf. 8:17-21) - although the rebukes which are given to the disciples in Mark suggest that he believed that they should have been able to apprehend the truth immediately. In view, however, of the important place which private instruction given to the disciples has in this gospel, it is more probable that Mark interpreted the saying in the former way.



It remains to see whether the alleged inconsistency between vv.33 and 34 can also be removed<sup>(126)</sup>. Although Mark may not have been the most skilful of editors, it is a priori unlikely that he would have allowed two contiguous verses, almost a single sentence, to stand if he had seen an obvious contradiction. It is, therefore, unlikely that he intended v.33 to state that Jesus suited his methods to the inability of the crowd to understand teaching in other forms. He has already stated uncompromisingly that it was the divine purpose to prevent the crowds from understanding the message of Jesus and as a result from repentance and obtaining forgiveness, and in v.34 he says that Jesus spoke to the crowds only in obscure sayings. It would seem probable that he understood v.33 as expressing this same fact. Commentators have been misled concerning Mark's understanding of this verse because they have been convinced that Jesus must have used the parables in order to help the crowds to understand, and they have wished to find some evidence of this in the gospel records. We have suggested that both v.33 and v.34 may be Markan, but even if v.33 came from the tradition there are two ways in which Mark could have understood it which do not commit him to an interpretation which would involve him in such a contradiction. First we may note that Mark does not say *καθὼς ἠδυνάμην συνένοιαι* but *ἀκούειν*. In v.12 the crowds *ἀκούοντες ἀκούουσιν* but fail to understand. Mark may then have linked the hearing in v.33 with the use of the verb in v.12, and in this case what he was saying was that Jesus spoke the word to the crowds and they heard it in the way that they were able to hear it, i.e. without understanding, because God had not granted them this ability and Jesus did not give them any interpretation but restricted his explanation to his disciples. It is true that *ἀκούειν* has the sense of 'understand' in 8:18, the meaning which is required by the usual interpretation of the present verse, but even there overtones of the Isaiah passage quoted in 4:12 are found. In 7:14, which occurs in a section closely related in structure to the present passage, hearing is distinguished from understanding (cf. 7:18). The saying, 'Who hath ears to hear, let him hear' (4:9, 23) suggests that understanding depends upon an ability which is predestined and accords with 4:11-12. Coming after the interpretation of the parable of the Sower in which the sower



sows 'the word' which had different results in the various soils, Mark may well have thought that Jesus spoke 'the word' to the crowds, but only those who were granted understanding could discover its meaning<sup>(127)</sup>.

This appears to be the most likely explanation of Mark's inclusion of this verse. A second possibility, however, may be mentioned. Mark may have regarded Jesus' use of 'parables' as a deliberate concealing of the gospel from those who were predestined not to receive God's forgiveness, and  $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma\ \eta\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$  might be interpreted, 'as they were allowed to hear it', a sense of  $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\theta\alpha\iota$  not too distant from that in 2:7, 19 (cf. the sense of  $\delta\upsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\iota$  in several Old Testament passages, e.g. Gen 43:32; Deut 7:22; 12:17; 14:24; 16:5; 17:15; 22:3; 28:27, 35; Jud 21:18, although always with the negative)<sup>(128)</sup>.

Thus it is suggested that Mark thought of  $\mu\alpha\rho\beta\omicron\lambda\eta$  in terms of the Hebrew  $\mu\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$  and the Aramaic  $\mathfrak{ܡܐܕܢܐ}$ , and because he moved rather uncertainly over the semantic range of the semitic word, he tended to stress the obscurity of Jesus' sayings. Only those who have been given divine understanding or who have received explanations of the teaching are able to grasp its true meaning. For this reason the private interpretations given to the disciples are of great importance and to this we must now turn.

First to be considered is how far this programme is carried through with the parables which Mark includes<sup>(129)</sup>, and then to examine all the examples of private instruction in Mark's gospel.

As Mally has pointed out<sup>(130)</sup>, 7:14-23 is similar in structure to 4:1-20.

4:1-2	A very great crowd gathered	7:14	Jesus called the crowd
	he said in his teaching		he said to them
	listen		listen to me all of you and understand
4:3-9	parable of the Sower	7:15	parable of the things which defile a man
4:9	whoever has ears... (7:16		If anyone has ears...)
4:10	when he was alone those who were about	7:17	When he had entered a house away from the crowd, his



him with the Twelve asked the meaning of the parables		disciples asked him the meaning of the parable
4:11-12 method of teaching by parables	-	(no parallel, but note συνιετε, 7:14, cf. μη συνιασι, 4:12)
4:13 do you not know this?	7:18	Are you so without understanding? Do you not perceive?
4:14-20 interpretation of the 'parable'	7:18b-23	interpretation of the 'parable'

In both pericopae there is the initial teaching to the crowd through a παραβολή, reinforced by the solemn ἀκούετε, and in 4:10 by the saying, 'Whoever has ears to hear, let him hear'. (A similar saying occurs in 7:16 in most MSS, but is omitted by <sup>1</sup>BL 28 bo geo, and is accepted by Rawlinson, Taylor and others, although most regard it as a gloss from 4:9.) The explanation is given to the disciples privately in response to their request and Jesus expresses surprise that they do not understand. Moreover, although there is no equivalent to 4:11-12 in chapter 7, the verb συνιεναι is picked up in 7:14 (and cf. ἀκούετε in 7:18). Both passages, therefore, follow the method of teaching which was described in 4:34. Mally notes further that the explanation has the character of a secret revelation, since it is not only given privately to the disciples who are rebuked for their failure to understand the parable, but even vv.18b-19 are highly enigmatic (in Mt 15:17-18 the saying is simplified by the addition of εἰς το στόμα and ἐκ τοῦ στόματος, and the omission of several phrases), and the content of the saying is extended beyond the question of eating with unwashed hands. He concludes that Mark sees this as a further revelation of the mystery of the kingdom of God. Cranfield also sees the mystery of the 'parable' in v.15 as the mystery of the kingdom, 'which is the mystery of the person of Jesus',<sup>(131)</sup>. Whether this is reading into this passage too many of the ideas of chapter 4 or not, it is clear that for Mark the teaching of Jesus came to the crowd in παραβολαί and that only those who were granted understanding and to whom Jesus interpreted the parables could grasp their meaning.

The logion in 13:28-29 is slightly different from the two passages which have been considered in that it occurs in the



longest consecutive section of teaching in Mark's gospel, the whole passage being addressed to the 'four' disciples as an explanation of the saying about the destruction of the temple (13:3-4)<sup>(132)</sup>. The private teaching of Jesus will be considered later; for the present the discussion will be confined to this short saying. Most commentators limit their discussion to a consideration of the original context of the parable and to difficulties in the interpretation of v.29. Taylor thinks that the phrase ἀπο δε της συκης μαθετε την παραβολην was formed by Mark to fit the parable to the present context, and he notes Luke's 'And he told them a parable', with Lohmeyer's suggestion that the original introduction was, 'The kingdom of God is like a tree'<sup>(133)</sup>. The phrase, however, is important for understanding Mark's thought. He is not setting out the parable of the fig tree, but presents the interpretation of the mystery of the fig tree. These verses are, in fact, an explanation within the longer interpretation of vv.5-37. The παραβολη which has to be explained may be simply the new growth of the fig tree in the spring, the fig being one of the few deciduous trees in Palestine, as Lagrange pointed out<sup>(134)</sup>, or there may be some more esoteric meaning<sup>(135)</sup>, but the παραβολη belongs to the tree itself and not to any description by Jesus<sup>(136)</sup>. Here then is a secret explanation, not of public teaching or even of any saying by Jesus, but of the symbolic meaning to be found in the fig tree.

By contrast 3:23-29 contains a collection of παραβολαι, probably assembled by Mark, addressed to the opponents of Jesus rather than the crowd, and without any added interpretation. Scholars who limit the meaning of παραβολη to 'similitude', 'comparison', or even 'picturesque and allusive maxim'<sup>(137)</sup> tend to restrict the 'parables' to vv.24-25, viewing vv.27-29 as independent sayings. But Mark almost certainly intended the whole collection of sayings which he assembled in 3:23-29 as παραβολαι. Perhaps, therefore, more should be understood by v.30 than simply 'Mark's explanatory comment pointing back to v.22'<sup>(138)</sup>. Mark plainly regarded the whole section as the answer to the scribes. Baird, however, lists 3:26 as an explanation given to the hard core opponents and we must pause to consider whether this is correct. Presumably he regards vv.24-25 as the parable which



is followed first by an interpretation (v.26), then by a further parable (v.27) and an independent saying which is not a parable (vv.28-29). (This is somewhat uncertain because he lists 3:27 as an unexplained parable but does not expressly include the parable of the Sower in his table, although he gives 4:13-20 as a semi-allegorical explanation.) Most commentators see here a pronouncement story to which have been attached two independent sayings<sup>(139)</sup>, but Cranfield defends the unity and historicity of the section<sup>(140)</sup>. Since Mark certainly treats the passage as a single unit this is of less importance here. The question to be answered, therefore, is whether Mark interpreted the passage as a parable with its interpretation (vv.24-25, 26) prefaced by a question (v.23b) and followed by two further unexplained parables (vv.27 and 28-29), or whether we accept his statement that these sayings were all 'parables'. Despite the change of conjunction and mood between vv.24-25 and 26 (ἐν + aor.subj. and ἐν + aor.indic.), it is unlikely that grammatical niceties can be pressed (cf. σταθῆναι and στήναι which most regard as equivalent in meaning, and δύναται and δύνησεται which also have a similar sense), and since Mark elsewhere clearly indicates when he is giving explanations it is unlikely that he does this here. Thus either the παραβολαί are the individual sayings or the teaching ἐν παραβολαῖς applies to the total argument, as Cranfield suggests<sup>(141)</sup>.

So far it has been shown that Mark saw the παραβολαί primarily as obscure sayings which needed to be explained if they were to be understood, and because he moved easily between the different shades of meaning of  $\text{ܠܥܡܪ} / \text{ܕܥܡܪ}$  he laid a certain emphasis upon the story parables and similes as παραβολαί. Many, however, assert that 12:1-9(11), the final passage in which παραβολή occurs, proves that the parables were readily understood by their original hearers and that they were not intended deliberately to conceal the truth<sup>(142)</sup>. This is not absolutely certain for two reasons. Firstly, Mark at least may have understood the situation slightly differently. Although both here and in the gospel of Thomas the saying about the stone is linked to the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, these were originally almost certainly two independent sayings<sup>(143)</sup>. Mark states that Jesus was speaking ἐν παραβολαῖς



(plural) and this is frequently taken adverbially<sup>(144)</sup>. It has been noted, however, that the two later gospel writers tend to interpret Mark hellenistically, and interpret παραβολή as a story parable. This could well account for their alterations. Perhaps the plural should be given due weight and 12:10-11 be taken as a second παραβολή. If this is so, is it another piece of evidence that Mark retains the wider and more fluid sense of the word? This is not absolutely certain, because in v.12 he uses the singular. Did he treat 12:1-11 as one parable after all, or was he referring either to vv.1-9 or 10-11? Secondly, Mark's final comment should be examined with care. A common interpretation is that the opponents of Jesus (the chief priests, scribes and elders of 11:27) understood the meaning of the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, probably identifying themselves with the tenants<sup>(145)</sup>, but the interpretations of the other synoptic writers must not be imported into Mark. Matthew's 'They perceived that he spoke of them (περὶ αὐτῶν)' shows that he applied his own allegorical interpretation of the parable to the Jewish leaders and believed that they had done the same. Mark simply says that they knew that Jesus had spoken the parable περὶ αὐτοῦς - not simply 'with reference to them' but 'against them'. E. Schweizer, despite his existentialist exegesis, moves towards a correct understanding of this verse. He stresses that these sayings are parables, and that no private instruction is given to the disciples because that had already been given in 8:31. For Mark a parable is a figurative way of speaking about God which demands a full response not merely intellectual understanding, a willingness to accept or reject it; it is not an illustration to simplify difficult teaching. Thus, although the Jewish leaders understood what Jesus said, this was no divine revelation but led to judgement and not salvation. But Mark was no existentialist. To him a παραβολή was primarily an obscure saying whether an allegory which needed a key to decipher it or an aphorism which had to be explained. What the leaders were aware of was not the meaning of the parable, but that it was a threat aimed at them. Perhaps we can be even more precise. They might recognize the allusions to Is 5 and Ps 118, but because divine understanding was denied them they could not give it its correct interpretation in terms of the kingdom of God and the messiahship of Jesus.



In the light of the foregoing discussion, it may then be seen that Mark's statements in chapter 4 about Jesus' method of teaching can be applied to all the sayings which he designates as  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota$ . All can be comprised under this word so long as it is recognized that Mark thinks in semitic terms. Parables are both stories and aphorisms, but underlying both is the sense that they are obscure sayings which need divine insight or dominical explanations if they are to be understood. Without this the hearers are necessarily unable to comprehend the meaning and so obtain God's salvation. In chapter 4 three major parables are told to the crowd, together with several smaller ones, of which one is interpreted to the disciples. In 7:14-23 there is again parable and interpretation. 13:28-29 and 12:1-11 are parables without interpretations. But as so often, Mark still leaves unresolved problems. If the 'parables' require explanations, why are there so few of these in this gospel? And is the 'parabolic' teaching restricted to those sayings which Mark explicitly defines as  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota$ ? These questions will call for discussion later, but first the other passages in which Mark depicts Jesus giving private instruction to his disciples may be examined.

A.W. Mosley has made a valuable contribution here in analyzing the Markan references to private explanations given to the disciples<sup>(146)</sup>. On the basis of six passages, 4:10ff., 33f.; 7:17ff.; 9:11f., 28 and 10:10f, with some allusion to other passages, he argues that Mark carefully distinguished between teaching given to the crowd and that given privately to the disciples. Since Jesus' teaching was not intended to be obscure and in fact was easily understood by his hearers, the practice of giving private explanations was created by Mark himself and did not come from the tradition. He supports this conclusion positively by noting the presence of characteristic Markan language in these passages and negatively by the fact that the words of Jesus in these sections are of doubtful authenticity whereas it would be expected that such private teaching would have been carefully preserved, and further by the frequent removal by Matthew and Luke of these situations where Jesus gives private teaching. He suggests that Mark may have developed this literary device because in the tradition explanations of Jesus' teaching were preserved separately from the teaching itself and that Mark wished to avoid suggesting that Jesus gave these explan-



ations openly to the crowd. The secrecy might also reflect the fact that the explanations were less well-known in the early church than the other teaching of Jesus. In this Mosley has rightly stressed the importance of trying to understand the reasons for Mark's actions, but like several others, he moves too quickly to the question of the authenticity of the teaching. Only when we have discovered Mark's interpretation of the life and teaching of Jesus do we possess a solid foundation from which to tackle the more difficult problem of the underlying tradition. And this must be traced not only, indeed not even primarily, in the Markan redaction, but in the completed gospel which Mark has produced.

An approach to the problem of the private teaching which Jesus gave to his disciples must proceed along two paths. First those passages need to be considered where Mark explicitly points to the explanations being given privately, in a house or when Jesus and his disciples are alone. Secondly, all those sayings are to be examined where Mark designates the audience as the disciples.

Mark indicates that Jesus was alone with his disciples and away from the crowd by three types of phrase: εἰς ὄκρυ (7:17; 9:28), εἰς τὴν ὄκρυαν (10:10, cf. 7:24), ἐν τῇ ὄκρυ (9:33), κατ' ἰδιάν (4:34; 9:28; 13:3), and κατὰ μέρος (4:10). Mosley argues that εἰς ὄκρυ is a Markan formula occurring constantly in editorial introductions and he contrasts it with εἰς τὴν ὄκρυαν. This does not seem to be quite correct. εἰς ὄκρυ (admittedly with a following genitive and not absolutely) occurs in 8:3, 26, and Luke has the phrase in Lk 14:1 (again with a genitive). Also it should be observed that the phrase is not restricted to situations where Jesus gives private teaching (cf. 2:1; 3:19). Too much weight, therefore, must not be placed upon the exact phrases used, but the total setting as Mark describes it must be considered.

Two types of withdrawal from the crowd are found in this gospel. Frequently the crowd is depicted as thronging Jesus, who endeavours to escape from the people (e.g. 1:35-38; 3:9, 19b-20; 4:1, 35-36; 6:45; 7:24, 33; 8:9-10; cf. 9:25), although Mark also depicts Jesus as teaching the crowd, and on two occasions he calls the crowd to him in order to give them teaching (7:14; 8:34). Of immediate concern, however, is a second set of passages



in which Jesus leaves the crowd in order to give private teaching to his disciples. Several of these have already been discussed. 4:34 gives the programme for Jesus' teaching. 4:10 and 7:17 introduce explanations of *παρεβόλαι*, while 13:3 prepares for the extended teaching which follows on from the disciples' question about the saying in 13:2. In a similar manner 10:10 marks the transition from the teaching about divorce given to the Pharisees to the private instruction given to the disciples. 9:28 is not essentially different, except that the reason for the disciples' question is their failure to exorcize a demon rather than their inability to understand what Jesus had been teaching. The final instance, 9:33, is less simple. A full consideration of the teaching of this passage must be left till later<sup>(147)</sup>. Here the discussion is limited to the form of the pericope. Following hints by Black and Nineham<sup>(148)</sup> we might conclude that the *παῖδες / οἱ υἱοὶ* (= both 'child' and 'servant') is the parable/mashal which the disciples have to 'receive'. (Black designates this as a true mashal, 'an enigmatic comparison requiring interpretation'.) This, however, does not fit the phrasing of v.37, and unless we conclude that Mark adopted this verse from a different tradition and failed to notice that it did not adequately express the idea of the parable it will have to be rejected, attractive though it is. The central problem is finding any real connexion of thought between vv.33-35 and 36-37. Possibly it must be acknowledged that the whole section from v.33 to the end of the chapter is a collection of independent sayings compiled by Mark, perhaps on a catchword basis, and we should not try to find any special significance in their being presented as private instruction to the disciples beyond the fact that in Mark it is only to the Twelve that such teaching is given.

With these passages may be included 8:14-21 in which the disciples are alone with Jesus in a boat, a notoriously difficult pericope. While Cranfield defends the historicity both of the two feeding miracles and of this incident<sup>(149)</sup>, most commentators find here a Markan construction on the grounds that it presupposes the exact working of the two miracles in 6:35-44 and 8:1-9 and that the passage is composite, 8:15 being an isolated saying found in a different setting in Lk 12:1 and out of place here<sup>(150)</sup>.



Questions concerning the authenticity of the sayings, however, are not of concern in the endeavour to discover Mark's purpose in recounting the incident.

Several details must first be noticed. ὅπως νοεῖτε οὐδε συνιετε; recalls 4:12-13 and 7:14-18, and ἑσθλα μὲν ἔχοντες οὐ βλεπετε containing allusions to Jer 5:21 and Ezek 12:2 (cf. Is 42:18-20, 23), is closely linked to the thought and language of 4:12. Thus Mark appears to intend this narrative as a further revelation to the disciples of the μυστηρίων. Yet no explanation is given. Instead, a series of questions recalls the exact details of the numbers of people fed, the loaves used and the κοφίνους and σπυρίδες filled with broken pieces. Various suggestions have been made about the meaning which Mark intended to convey, but here we are occupied with the construction of Mark's narrative. The saying in v.15 is a παραβολή in Mark's sense, which the disciples fail to understand. The following events then closely follow the pattern of 4:10-20 and 7:17-23 (and indeed 13:3ff.) except that the disciples do not ask Jesus for the meaning of the saying but display their lack of understanding by discussing their lack of bread. As in 4:11-12 and chapter 13, Jesus' answer does not latch on to the previous saying but discusses a different, though related, point, but here there is no subsequent return to the initial question. A new feature, however, emerges, for now it appears that the miracles (or at least the feeding miracles) as well as the parables have a hidden meaning which it needs divine insight to perceive, and Jesus hopes to awaken this understanding by his questions which call upon the disciples to 'remember' (a word which has revelatory overtones in the Old Testament, cf. Deut 4:9-15 and Josh 24:2-13) the details of the two feedings. This is supported by Mark's placing of the Pharisees' request for a 'sign' immediately before this incident. The Pharisees cannot be given a sign because they are men whose eyes are divinely blinded<sup>(151)</sup>. The miracles, however, are a sign in almost a Johannine sense for those who have this understanding.

It has been shown that all the references to private teaching recount explanations to the disciples (i.e. to the Twelve, or a smaller circle within the Twelve). So far an examination of Mark's use of παραβολή and of these accounts of private explanations



has revealed no cause for questioning the theory that Mark regarded all the teaching given to the crowd as ἐν παραβόλαις which required divine enlightenment or dominical interpretation to make plain. Finally the sayings must be considered in the overall plan of the gospel.

Many attempts have been made to trace a plan in the construction of Mark's gospel and a variety of outlines are offered in the commentaries and elsewhere<sup>(152)</sup>. Here the broadest framework will be adopted. Major divisions occur at 8:27; 11:1 and 14:1<sup>(153)</sup>. The passion narrative in chapters 14-15 is distinct from the rest of the gospel both in form and content, and although four incidents in it contain teaching, these come only marginally within the purview of this analysis.

In Table IV the main collections of sayings in the first three sections of the book are set out according to their position in the gospel and the audiences to which they are addressed, and indications are also given of the form of the pericope in which the sayings occur, basically following the analysis of Taylor<sup>(154)</sup>. It will be observed that the sayings in 1:14 - 3:35 consist almost entirely of pronouncement stories, mainly addressed to opponents (the only exception is 3:31-35 on Jesus' true family). Between 4:1 and 8:26 the teaching is given in parables and sayings, apart from the mission charge in 6:8-11, and the programme of enigmatic public teaching with explanations given to the disciples is closely adhered to. Between 8:27 and 10:52 the sayings are entirely spoken to the disciples with three notable exceptions, the teaching on discipleship in 8:34 - 9:1, which Mark states was given to the crowd together with the disciples, the teaching on divorce in 10:2-9, which is given to opponents but which fits the pattern of obscure public teaching followed by private instruction for the Twelve, and the dialogue with the rich man (10:17-22), which is again followed by private teaching. The form critics find few pronouncement stories in this section, Taylor listing only 9:38-39, the strange exorcist, 10:1-9, on divorce, and 10:13-16, 'suffer little children'. (In addition to these there is possibly 10:17-22, the rich man's question, 10:23-27, the dialogue about riches, and 10:28-31, the question of rewards, although Taylor prefers to classify these as stories about Jesus, in which



category he also places 8:27-33, Peter's confession, and 10:35-40, the request of James and John.) After 11:1 the pattern again changes, most of the teaching being addressed to opponents, mainly in pronouncement stories although 12:1-12 comprises a parable and a saying, but with a long section of private instruction in chapter 13 and a few other sayings addressed to the disciples and to the crowd, and as in the first section of the gospel these crowd logia are specifically designated 'teaching' (11:17, 18; 12:35, 38).

Of the three main types of teaching material, parables and sayings addressed to the crowd, explanations given to the disciples, and teaching in pronouncement stories mainly involving opponents, the last stand apart from the rest of the teaching. They are grouped in the first and third parts of the gospel, the method of teaching in them is more 'rabbinic' than in most of the other teaching, and the content is more concerned with ritual and morality. Since Martin Albertz the view has been commonly accepted that Mark either compiled these collections of conflict stories or used earlier collections<sup>(155)</sup>. The stories are important for understanding Mark's view of the nature of Jesus' teaching, but they can be passed over at this stage of the discussion.

T.W. Manson examined the kingdom of God and Son of man sayings in Mark's gospel according to their audience and their relation to Peter's confession<sup>(156)</sup>. He argued that the last reference to the kingdom as future is in 9:1, after which Jesus speaks of entering the kingdom, and that, apart from 12:34, all the sayings from that point are addressed to the disciples, and even 12:34 is spoken to a friendly scribe. Similarly, apart from 2:10 and 2:28, which he regarded as misunderstandings of  $\text{בְּנֵי אָדָם}$ , all the Son of man sayings occur after Peter's confession, and apart from 14:62 (and partially 8:38) all are addressed to the disciples. His observations were correct for Mark, although he was probably mistaken in supposing that this represented the historical facts, and he may not have rightly understood Mark's intention.

It has already been seen that several passages in 8:27 - 10:52 are explanations to the Twelve (9:29, 10:11-12 to which 9:9-13 and 10:23-31 may plausibly be added). The pericope about the



welcome to be given to children (10:13-16) is a pronouncement story and on this account may be considered to be in a slightly different position from the other teaching, as may the narrative of the strange exorcist (9:38-39). Thus the sayings which demand immediate discussion are all linked with the three predictions of the passion. The questions which must be answered are: Are the three predictions simply repetitions introduced by Mark to emphasize what for him was the central feature of the gospel or can any development be traced? Why does Mark introduce the first two predictions with διδάσκειν, the only teaching given to the Twelve to be so introduced? Why does Mark bring in the crowd at 8:34 where its presence is historically implausible?

Views about the three-fold prediction of the passion range from an acceptance of all three accounts as historically accurate<sup>(157)</sup> to the view that they are Markan constructions based upon a single saying which itself was created within the faith of the early church<sup>(158)</sup>. The present concern is not with historicity but with Mark's intention. Although it is easy to see a similar basic pattern between the three accounts, an attempt to understand Mark's purpose should begin by noting the differences. Taylor has set out the three predictions alongside the Markan passion story<sup>(159)</sup> and draws attention to the much greater detail in the third prophecy. In addition to this it may be observed that Mark expressly states that the disciples did not understand the words of Jesus in 8:32-33 and 9:32, but does not do so after 10:33-34. (Some regard the request of James and John as an indication that the disciples failed to understand. This may be so, but it is not clear that this was what Mark intended to point out.) Further, 10:33-34 is introduced by a singularly forthright explanation of what the saying means: 'He began to tell them the things that were to happen unto him', while the saying itself begins, 'Behold we go up to Jerusalem ...' Is it not possible that Mark regarded the first two sayings as παραβόλαι which the Twelve should have understood but which they failed to grasp and that the final prediction is the explanation? This interpretation might seem to be refuted by the statement that Jesus spoke the saying 'openly'.

Παρηγοία occurs only at 8:32 in the synoptic gospels. In John, where it occurs fairly frequently, it is used of open,



public action (Jn 7:4, 13, 26; 11:54; 18:20) and of plain, direct speech (Jn 10:24; 11:14), especially in contrast to speaking ἐν παραμυαῖς (Jn 16:25, 29), and most commentators give this latter meaning here<sup>(160)</sup>. Jesus is not portrayed as speaking to a larger circle than the Twelve, for the crowd is explicitly summoned in v.34, thus the meaning can hardly be 'publicly'. But despite the parallels in Jn 16, Mark does not explicitly contrast παραμυαῖς with ἐν παραβολαῖς, and Peter's rebuke of Jesus is not expressed as it is in Mt 16:22. It has been noted that the incident has similarities both with the temptation narratives in Q<sup>(161)</sup> and the exorcisms in 1:25 and 9:25 (cf. 4:39), and the rebuke of Peter sets him side by side with 'men', i.e. those outside the circle of the Twelve to whom the μυστήριον is not revealed. Thus however 'plainly' the word may have been spoken, it was not understood and proved to be still a παραβολή. However they are to be taken, interpretations of the μυστήριον are given to the disciples. Either the teaching is enigmatic in 8:31 and 9:31, with the explanation in 10:33-34, or all three passages are explanations of the messiahship expressed in Peter's confession, at least the first two of which were misunderstood by the disciples. If the former is correct, however, it provides the answer to the second question which otherwise is most puzzling. Mark has used διδάσκειν of the teaching given to the disciples because it was the same kind of enigmatic speech which was normally addressed to the crowds, and like that teaching it also needed spiritual understanding or an explanation if it was to be comprehended.

The phrase 'And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples' (8:34) is regarded by some as derived from a sayings source from which 8:34 - 9:1 was taken<sup>(162)</sup> or as an editorial link inserted by Mark<sup>(163)</sup>. The view that Mark included the crowd to show that 'this is something all men need to know and there is no secrecy about it'<sup>(164)</sup> is out of line with Mark's understanding of the μυστήριον and cannot be accepted as an explanation of the audience. The suggestion that the introduction was found in the sayings source is just possible, but it is unlikely, for it is uncertain whether Mark used such a written source, and while such a source might have contained allusions to the audience it is highly improbable that these would have



been in this form rather than simply 'and he said to ...' Mark's purpose in introducing the crowd at this point is obscure. There are certain similarities to 7:14, but there the enigmatic teaching given to the crowd is subsequently explained to the disciples. Here the teaching is so similar to that in 10:43-50 which is given to the disciples that it is impossible not to feel that it would be more appropriate as directed to the disciples alone.

It is now possible to give some answer to the question of the discrepancy between Mark's use of διδάσκ- words and the paucity of Jesus' teaching included in his gospel. On p.30 two possible explanation were suggested: that Mark did not view Jesus as a teacher but used διδάσκαλε as an honorific title and did not intend διδάσκειν in a purely didactic sense, or that because he interpreted the title rabbi in a Greek, intellectual, way he was led to insert the references to teaching and to collect as many of Jesus' sayings as he could obtain. It has been seen that διδάσκαλε is used in several non-teaching contexts and that Mark appears to have understood it as an honorific title himself rather than as 'Teacher'. His use of διδάσκειν is more ambiguous, but his theory that Jesus taught the crowds in enigmatic παραβόλαι which required interpretation or divinely given insight before they could be understood appears to have been applied consistently throughout the first three main sections of the gospel. To Mark, apparently, διδάσκειν does not have its full, intellectual sense but refers to the allusive, symbolic, parabolic and hence obscure utterances of Jesus, which were addressed mainly, though not exclusively, to the crowd<sup>(165)</sup>.

So far the concern has been with the form of the teaching and the audiences to whom it was addressed. The content of that teaching must now be considered in order to discover what Mark understood the μυστήρια to be and what place ethics had in his view of the gospel. This will involve first a closer examination of the sayings addressed to opponents in the pronouncement stories which so far have been left aside.



Chapter IIJESUS AND HIS OPPONENTS

Apart from the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen with the attached 'stone' passage, the sayings of Jesus which Mark has addressed to opponents and to individuals who are not disciples is embedded in those forms of tradition which Bultmann has named controversy, scholastic and biographical apophthegms and which Taylor has called pronouncement stories and stories about Jesus. This use of pronouncement stories is significant. By preferring this type of teaching to the words of condemnation which are found in the other two gospels (in Mark only 12:38-40, contrast Mt 23 and Lk 11:37-52), Mark brings into prominence the idea of conflict between Jesus and his opponents, with a view to showing that Jesus was always able to triumph over his questioners<sup>(1)</sup>. There are, however, several other features about these stories which are significant, especially remembering Bultmann's claim that it was through the apophthegms that the teaching of Jesus entered the gospel<sup>(2)</sup>.

First, none of these pronouncements is described by Mark as teaching, and even when further sayings are attached to what appear to be the original pronouncement stories, they are not introduced by any phrase containing a reference to teaching (e.g. 2:21-22, 27-28; 3:27-29). At most the stories are occasionally set in a context of teaching (10:2-9, cf. 10:1; 12:28-34, cf. 12:35), although that teaching is given to the crowds and not to opponents. Within the pericopae the words of Jesus are spoken in reply to a question or a comment made by the opponents<sup>(3)</sup>. Probably too much should not be made of this, since it may be due in part to the fixed form in which the stories reached Mark, but it underlines the fact that Mark regards 'teaching' as given primarily to the crowd.

Secondly, except for the teaching about divorce in 10:2-9 which stands apart from the other stories in several respects and will be considered in detail separately, no explanation of the sayings is given to the disciples privately<sup>(4)</sup>. It appears that Mark did not regard these pronouncements as the kind of enigmatic teaching which needed to be explained, and the questions must therefore be raised whether he regarded the stories as giving



'teaching' in his sense at all, and if not what purpose he had in incorporating these stories into his gospel.

The oddity of these two features becomes more apparent when it is further seen that the form of the arguments in these stories is more 'rabbinic' than that found elsewhere in Mark. The method of argument here through the use of scriptural quotations and the asking of a counter-question is thoroughly in the style of the rabbis<sup>(5)</sup> and suggests that the purpose of these stories in the tradition related closely to practical living, even though the stories themselves contain a rejection of some of the current traditions of the rabbis, as in 7:6-8, 9-13. This leads directly to a further preliminary observation.

It is not easy to classify the teaching of Jesus which is found in Mark's gospel and the terms 'moral' and 'ethical' are somewhat imprecise, but the more obviously ethical teaching in Mark is found in such pericopae. It is to these narratives that writers on the ethics of Jesus mainly turn for evidence upon which to base their discussions, noting such topics as divorce (10:2-9), political obedience (12:13-17) and the love commandment (12:28-34), and deriving moral instruction from such passages as Jesus' associating with sinners (2:15-17), the question of fasting (2:19-20), sabbath observance (2:23-26; 3:1-5), and the relation between morality and ritual observances (7:1-8), while pointing to the teaching about sin and forgiveness in 2:5b-10 and 3:22-30. Apart from 7:14-23, most of the remaining ethical teaching in Mark is found in those sections of the gospel which deal with the strenuous call to discipleship (8:34-38; 9:38-50; 10:17-31, 35-45) and the two pericopae concerning children (9:33-37; 10:13-16)<sup>(6)</sup>. The questions must ultimately be raised, how Mark understood this teaching and what place it has in the overall structure of his gospel, but first the pronouncement stories and other teaching addressed to opponents require to be examined in detail.

Opinion is sharply divided about the correct analysis of the pericope of the healing of the paralytic (2:1-12). Three main suggestions have been put forward: that an account of a healing miracle in vv.1-5a, 10b-12 has been combined with a saying about forgiveness (vv.5b-10a)<sup>(7)</sup>, that the passage is a unity apart from v.10 (or 10a) which is held to be a Christian comment on



the incident, possibly coming from Mark himself in the same way that 7:19b 'making all meats clean' is often thought to be<sup>(8)</sup>, or that the section is an original whole<sup>(9)</sup>. Of these the second seems least likely, not so much because it involves assuming that Mark used 'Son of man' as a title for Jesus, for Stephen's words in Acts 7:56 show that the title was used by others than Jesus himself and Mark certainly identified Jesus with the Son of man, but because 2:10a is different in form from 7:19b and does not look like a comment. The real offence of the verse in the eyes of many commentators is that it will not fit into their ideas of the meaning of the title 'Son of man'. Simply to remove this half verse does not solve the greater problem of the absence of the scribes from the end of the pericope. One must, therefore, either explain the difficult sequence of phrases or accept a composite structure for the passage.

It is certainly attractive to see here the combination of a miracle story and a pronouncement story<sup>(10)</sup>, for then the awkward phrasing of v.10 is eliminated and the scribes are no longer an embarrassment at the conclusion of the story. It is less easy, however, to accept that vv. 5b-10a once existed as an independent pronouncement story from which the beginning and end were removed in order to fit it into the miracle story, or that it so completely lacks the vividness of the latter story<sup>(11)</sup>. The beginning and end must have been substantially the same as at present, for the paralyzed man is lying on a bed and he must have taken it up and walked away to clinch the argument, while presumably someone had brought him to Jesus. Too great emphasis should not be placed upon the grammatical and logical difficulties of v.10, since despite the considerable changes which Matthew and Luke make in the rest of the narrative they follow the Markan wording very closely at this point and evidently found it acceptable Greek<sup>(12)</sup>. It seems probable, therefore, that this pericope is substantially in the form in which it came to Mark and any consideration of the interpretation which he gave it must accept this as a basis.

Although v.10a is not to be adjudged as Mark's own comment on the incident<sup>(13)</sup>, it seems likely that he regarded the verse as central. For him the importance of the saying seems to be



that Jesus not merely claims the authority to forgive sins, an authority which truly belongs to God alone, but by his work of healing proves that he possesses the power<sup>(14)</sup>. It is clear that Mark identified Jesus with the Son of man, for the saying possesses no meaning in its present setting on any other supposition, and the Son of man sayings in 8:31; 10:32-34; 14:21, 41-42 make this abundantly plain<sup>(15)</sup>. If Mark has, indeed, presented this series of pronouncement stories as a set of conflicts reaching a climax in the plotting of the Pharisees and the Herodians to kill Jesus in 3:6, he may also have intended to show that the death of Jesus was brought about by the evil machinations of the Jewish leaders who refused to recognize the clear sign which he had given them. This is less certain, however, and it does not appear that the 'pronounced break' between 1:45 and 2:1 marks the start of a new section<sup>(16)</sup>. Breaks occur in the sequence of conflict stories at 2:13 and 2:23, and sayings and other material appear to have been inserted into the collection of stories in vv. 13-14 and 21-22. It is even less certain that Mark understood the phrase 'Son of man' in its 'full messianic sense',<sup>(17)</sup> if by that is meant that an existing and recognized messianic title was being applied to Jesus, for serious doubts have been cast upon the existence of such a title in Judaism<sup>(18)</sup>. It is more probable that Mark knew that Jesus had used this title, and believed that he had used it of himself primarily as the Son of God<sup>(19)</sup> who in this incident shows his authority to forgive sins. Possibly Mark linked this with the forgiveness Christians found in Jesus, but it is the Christological meaning which is dominant and the saying points to the significance of the effective words of forgiveness and healing. Thus the saying is not 'teaching' in Mark's sense, nor instruction as generally understood, although the total story says a great deal about the person and authority of Jesus. There is no ethical teaching and the form of the debate between Jesus and the scribes shows him as accepting the contemporary meaning of sin, for unless both he and his opponents agree on what constitutes sin the story has no meaning.

Although it is generally agreed that 2:13-14 and 15-17 were originally independent pericopae, Mark has combined them, or has accepted them as combined, and it is virtually certain that he



intends to depict the meal as being in Levi's house. Against the accusation that he is associating in table fellowship with tax collectors and 'sinners', Jesus defends himself with a proverb which commentators parallel from hellenistic sources and with a semitic style assertion that he came to 'call' sinners<sup>(20)</sup>. Since both Matthew and Luke make additions to the Markan pronouncement<sup>(21)</sup>, it is possible that the second of these sayings was added by Mark to the original proverb about the physician, but the completed narrative represents Mark's final intention.<sup>(22)</sup>

That Jesus associated with the outcasts of society is a firmly established historical fact<sup>(23)</sup>, and the well-known statements by Abrahams and Montefiore about the originality of Jesus' attitude to sinners have been frequently repeated<sup>(24)</sup>. As Nineham points out, this practice and the sayings in the present narrative have often been interpreted as introducing a new moral principle<sup>(25)</sup>, and in this way the pericope has been understood as expressing ethical teaching. It is doubtful, however, whether Mark understood the words of Jesus in this way. The emphasis in the story is placed upon Jesus' activity in calling sinners and there is no more indication that Mark linked this with the question of table fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians or between Christians and pagans than that any others in the early church looked to this incident as providing an answer to this intractable issue (cf. <sup>Acts</sup> 11:3; Gal 2:12ff.)<sup>(26)</sup>. Understanding of Mark's meaning can be obtained only by discovering how he interpreted the final saying. In a question by the Pharisees in a Palestinian setting 'sinners' undoubtedly meant not primarily gross transgressors of the law, but those whose occupations or lack of training in rabbinic casuistry led them to neglect the fulfilment of the law as the Pharisees understood it. It is going too far, however, simply to render ἁμαρτωλοὶ as 'outcasts'<sup>(27)</sup>. There is a shift of emphasis in v.17b which reveals Mark's thought. Here ἁμαρτωλοὶ are contrasted with the δίκαιοι. Nineham is correct in refusing to push aside the question of why Jesus did not come to call the 'righteous' although his answer, that this is the comment of the early Christians who were aware that they were saved sinners and mostly came from the lower ranks of society, is less certain<sup>(28)</sup>. The strong antithesis with the use of a denial for emphasis is semitic and the saying in itself could well go back to Jesus.



To Mark, however, the main point lies in the fact that Jesus calls sinners. The δίκαιοι are not the 'self-righteous' nor the Pharisees who compare their strictness in keeping the law with the outcasts who fail to do this, or with those who are ceremonially defiled. While care must be taken not to import 'Pauline' ideas into Mark, the similarities with 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners' (1 Tim 1:15) are close. The δίκαιοι are not 'they that justify themselves in the sight of man' (Lk 16:15)<sup>(29)</sup> but those who are unwilling to accept God's forgiveness because they are looking for salvation by keeping the law. This is supported by the 'more than local' sense of ἡλθεῖν<sup>(30)</sup>. The exact sense of καλεῖν is disputed. Luke interpreted it as the call to repentance (Lk 5:32) and some adopt this as the meaning here<sup>(31)</sup>. Other suggestions are that Jesus invites sinners to the messianic banquet<sup>(32)</sup> or to the kingdom of God<sup>(33)</sup> or to discipleship<sup>(34)</sup>. E. Schweizer<sup>(35)</sup> suggests that the summons is to the God who confronts men in Jesus. What is clear is that this saying as Mark uses it has direct application only to Jesus himself as the Son of God.

Thus this second pericope, like the healing of the paralytic, does not contain 'teaching' as such. The sayings to some extent defend Jesus' actions, but far more they reveal who he is and the purpose for which he came into the world. The original account may have had a different nuance, and the moral implications which have been drawn from Jesus' actions may well be legitimate<sup>(36)</sup>, but for Mark the pronouncement is a statement of the meaning of the coming of Jesus into the world.

The next story, the conflict over fasting (2:18-22), is commonly divided into three sections: vv.18-19a, a pronouncement story containing a genuine saying of Jesus in which he abrogates fasting as being unsuitable for the time when the kingdom of God has dawned, vv.19b-20, a later addition coming from the early church or from Mark himself, justifying the reintroduction of fasting after the Resurrection, and vv.21-22, two isolated sayings the meaning of which is obscure<sup>(37)</sup>. To discover Mark's interpretation the section must be considered as a whole. Nineham, following Klostermann, interprets it as follows: the coming of Jesus and his message of the kingdom of God are the supreme



occasion for rejoicing, and while fasting may have been a suitable means of preparation for the coming of the kingdom, with its dawning it is out of place; but Jesus will remain permanently with his disciples only when the kingdom has come in its fulness (see 9:1) and during the period between the death of Jesus and his return there will be occasion enough for mourning; yet this will be a new type of eschatological fasting, different in character and motivation from the old and thus radically incompatible with the practices of Judaism<sup>(38)</sup>.

This is correct in its stress on the eschatological emphasis in these verses, and it makes a serious attempt to explain the connexion between the saying about the patch and the wineskins and the preceding dispute about fasting. Nevertheless, it involves reading a considerable amount into the narrative and adopts an interpretation of the two final sayings which is more suitable to the aphorism about the wineskins than to that about garments. Moreover, it does not make clear whether the new type of fasting is to be envisaged as a regular, repeated ritual, akin to Jewish fasting although different in underlying motive, or whether the 'mourning' is distinct in form as well.

It should first be noticed that, as Haenchen has pointed out, two contrasts are expressed in this story: the fasting of the Pharisees and of the disciples of John is set against the non-fasting of Jesus' own disciples during his earthly ministry, and the new fast 'in that day' is compared with the earlier marriage feast when fasting is inappropriate<sup>(39)</sup>. It is this double conflict which has led so many commentators since Wellhausen to regard vv.19b-20 as a product of the early church. If the reference is to regular fasts (and Haenchen and others hold that 'in that day' points to weekly Friday fasting<sup>(40)</sup>), not only does the period of non-fasting lie for Mark in the distant past but Mark envisages a continuing history for the church. If, as we shall see later, this is unlikely, it is necessary to discover a new interpretation which will satisfy the demands of the whole pericope and is in accord with Mark's view of history.

Whether Jesus himself intended the saying to be allegorical or not<sup>(41)</sup> Mark certainly identified the bridegroom with Jesus, as he had previously so identified the Son of man<sup>(42)</sup>, whom he



portrays as messiah and Son of God. The essential contrast, 62  
therefore, is between the presence of the messiah with his disciples  
and his absence from them after his death. Is, then, the fasting  
(? = mourning) simply the sorrow of the disciples at the crucifixion  
of Jesus, a sorrow which the Resurrection brings to an end? It  
is the acceptance of this interpretation which has led some writers  
to question the authenticity of the saying as being a prediction  
of the passion too early in the ministry of Jesus<sup>(43)</sup>, and while  
it is possible it is by no means certain that this is how Mark  
understood the saying. Ebeling<sup>(44)</sup> objects to the view that  
the saying declares that Christians will fast after Jesus is  
parted from them on the ground that after the Resurrection the  
church believed that it was living in the period of salvation  
and that it was a time of joy not mourning, and he therefore  
applies it to the time of the messianic woes before the end  
when the Master will be removed from them. Kümmel objects that  
the absence of the Messiah at the time of the messianic woes  
is an idea not found anywhere in late Judaism or primitive  
Christianity, but in itself this is not a sufficient ground for  
denying this to be Mark's own view. The problem is linked with  
the question of the way in which Mark understood the period  
between the crucifixion and the parousia. It is far from certain  
that he thought of Jesus as continually present with his church  
as did Matthew (see Mt 28:20). The essential contrast is between  
the presence of the messiah with his disciples in the earthly  
life of Jesus and a period of absence from them. If the view  
that the story was told to defend either the failure of the early  
Christians to observe the Jewish fasts or the reintroduction of  
fasting when it was known that Jesus and his disciples did not practise  
such abstinence is put aside, then 'in that day' can be eschatolog-  
ical and can point not to weekly fasting but to the distress  
of the disciples during the period of their Lord's absence and  
while they await the parousia. Perhaps it points even more narrowly  
to the persecution and suffering preceding that end event<sup>(45)</sup>.  
Certainly there is no indication that Mark ever thought of fasting  
as a religious exercise or a good work as Matthew did (Mt 6:16-18)<sup>(46)</sup>.

Only Klostermann and Nineham among recent commentators appear  
to have attempted to show a connexion between the sayings about the  
patch and wineskins and the preceding narrative<sup>(47)</sup>. Treated as  
two independent sayings they have been interpreted in various



ways, of which Cranfield notes five - a defence of the disciples against those who wished to confine them within contemporary convention, the incompatibility of John's disciples' use of Pharisaic practices with the new situation indicated by their call to repentance, that the kingdom of God must destroy the old Judaism, the need for a new birth, and the uselessness of trying to mend one's life with a patch from the new<sup>(48)</sup>. All these proceed from a basis of the superiority of the new over the old, but this is not certain<sup>(49)</sup>. As Nineham comments, 'As they stand, the words appear to be at least as much concerned with the preservation of the old as with the welfare of the new'<sup>(50)</sup>.

The difficulty of explaining these verses in their present context is a possible indication that Mark collected as much of Jesus' teaching as he could find and provided settings in his gospel which appeared suitable to him, sometimes having to resort to the expedient of simply attaching isolated sayings to other pieces of tradition. But unless it is assumed that the present sayings were attached to the conflict story in the tradition as it reached Mark and he simply inserted the whole passage into his gospel, it is still necessary to offer some explanation of the meaning which they had for him here. The only common theme in the two sayings is the danger of the new for the old<sup>(51)</sup>. On the analogy of 2:15-17 and 23-28, these additional sayings should provide added reasons for the disciples' failure to fast. If this is so they may mean that the type of fasting practised by the disciples of John and the Pharisees has been destroyed by the new faith in Jesus, the Son of God. During Jesus' life-time such fasting was inappropriate; after his death the 'fasting' will consist of the distress at the Lord's absence in the period before the parousia. It is possible, however, that in the setting of a series of conflict stories the two sayings were interpreted simply as showing the incompatibility between the faith of Jesus and Judaism.

The two final conflict stories concern the keeping of the Sabbath and most commentators attribute their preservation to conflicts between the early church and the Jews or as a justification of the Gentile church's abandonment of the Jewish sabbath in favour of worship on the first day of the week. This may be one theme in the Markan formulation, but again it may be questioned whether



Mark lays the main emphasis there. Both pericopae are Christological rather than ethical and the central issue is the authority which belongs to Jesus.

As with the previous pericopae, many attempts have been made to separate out later additions from the original pronouncement story of the incident in the cornfields (2:23-28). Three answers to the Pharisees' questions appear in the completed narrative - the rabbinic type counter question with its reference to scripture (vv.25-26), the saying that the sabbath was made for man (v.27), and the assertion that the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath (v.28), and it is the apparent inconsistency between these answers which has led generally to suggestions that at least one of them did not belong to the original dispute<sup>(52)</sup>. It seems probable that Mark placed most emphasis upon the authority possessed by Jesus as the Son of man, but there are certain difficulties in his construction of the episode. ~~ὁ υἱος~~ links the Son of man saying closely with the statement that the Sabbath was made for man, although and the argument is 'not necessarily illogical' even if the Son of man means Jesus himself as messiah<sup>(53)</sup>, it must be admitted that the train of thought is not immediately clear. It is, however, no solution merely to assert that v.28 is a Christian comment supplementing v.27, nor is the difficulty overcome by the suggestion that Son of man is a mistranslation of 'man' or that 'man' in v.27 is really the Son of man. In v.27 Mark intends by 'man' either mankind in general or each individual man. Does he, as a Jewish Christian, recall the rabbis' statements about the Sabbath being 'for you'? And despite the omission of v.27 by Matthew and Luke (and the Western text)<sup>(54)</sup>, the Markan form of v.28 follows better after v.27 than after v.26, unless the reference to David is taken in a messianic sense and this seems unlikely in view of the stress on David's need and his hunger and Mark's rejection of the title 'son of David' for the messiah in 12:35.

In each of the preceding conflict stories Mark records the sayings of Jesus as replies to the initial question. In this pericope he may have combined three separate items from the tradition, but the fresh introduction in v.27 and the ~~ὁ υἱος~~ in v.28 suggest that he understood Jesus to have given two answers to the Pharisees, the example of David and a double saying about



the Sabbath. His radical attitude to Jewish ritual (cf. chapter 7) may well have led him to include vv.25-26, the statement that David broke the Old Testament law, thus showing on evidence from the Old Testament itself that the ritual demands of Judaism were not sacrosanct, but his main emphasis is placed upon the Son of man saying, and the argument here is much as Taylor describes it: 'Since the Sabbath was made for man, he who is man's Lord and Representative has authority to determine its laws and use,'<sup>(55)</sup> The objections which Taylor makes to this are largely due to the fact that he regards this claim as unsuitable on the lips of Jesus.

Although Mark asserts that Jesus is 'Lord of all that belongs to man, including the Sabbath,'<sup>(56)</sup> he gives no teaching about what activities are permitted or proscribed on the Sabbath<sup>(57)</sup> and he does not regard v.27 as a general principle which states that each individual is free to determine how he should observe the Sabbath; it was simply instituted for man's benefit. This is in contrast to what Matthew makes of the incident. Thus this pericope, which has been widely regarded as being created or preserved in the early church because it 'dealt with the burning issue of the observance of the Sabbath,'<sup>(58)</sup> has received its place in Mark's gospel because it once again points to the lordship of Christ.

The final conflict story in the series (3:1-6) contains what at first sight might appear to be further and more explicit teaching about Sabbath observance, yet here again a comparison with Matthew, where the narrative has been modified to conform more closely to the general pattern of this type of story by the alteration of the silent watching by members of the congregation into a hostile question and the insertion of a longer casuistic saying by Jesus, shows the relatively undeveloped form of this narrative<sup>(59)</sup>. V.6, whether redactional (so Bultmann) or an integral part of the story (so Taylor)<sup>(60)</sup> shows Mark's main purpose in including the story in his gospel - the hostility of the Jewish leaders which led finally to the cross is revealed. Some have found difficulty in the early appearance of the plot against Jesus' life, but there is no need to suggest that Mark simply took over the statement from his source or to stress that the collection of conflict stories is timeless. To Mark the conflict between



Jesus and the Jewish leaders forms a background to his whole ministry.

Jesus' question (v.4) has been variously explained. Some suggest that the contrast is between Jesus' act of healing which is 'doing good' and 'saving life' and the unexpressed desire of the opponents to kill him<sup>(61)</sup>. Others regard this as too subtle and think that Jesus means that to refrain from healing the man is the equivalent of 'doing evil',<sup>(62)</sup>. Heanthen appears to regard it as a trick question to which the opponents could make no direct answer<sup>(63)</sup>, while Lohmeyer suggests that beyond the contrast between the action of Jesus and that of his opponents a deeper thought is expressed in the ironical question, viz. that Jesus is the 'Doer of good and Saviour of life' in the fullest sense, and that the story reveals Jesus as the Son of man<sup>(64)</sup>. Similarly Nineham suggests that Jesus is defending an occasional breach of the Sabbath law in cases of special need, and the special need here is not danger to life, which the Pharisees would have allowed, but God's final battle against the forces of evil in which Jesus is engaged<sup>(65)</sup>.

The obscurity of the saying is in contrast to Matthew's version where Jesus gives specific teaching about the principle on which work may be performed on the Sabbath. This suggests that Mark is not concerned to present instructions on how to observe the Sabbath, but, as in the previous story, wishes to show Jesus as the one whom his enemies could not withstand in argument, and whom they would ultimately plot against and kill, but who with sovereign authority carried out his work of healing.

This survey of the five incidents in Mark 2:1 - 3:6 in which Jesus addresses opponents has shown that, whatever the reasons for their being preserved in the tradition, they were not used by Mark to present the teaching of Jesus. The emphasis throughout is placed upon the person of Jesus, who as Son of man and messiah has power to forgive sin and heal, offers the invitation to the messianic banquet to sinners, and has authority over all the activities of men and thus over the sabbath as well, although the increasing conflict with the Jewish leaders is a subsidiary theme. The reason for the absence of any explanation of the sayings, obscure and incomplete as they are in themselves, is



thus explained. Mark has not called these sayings teaching and they are not teaching either in his sense of the word or in ours<sup>(66)</sup>.

The second group of pronouncement stories is 11:27-33; 12:13-37. The first of these, the incident in which the Jewish leaders question Jesus' authority (11:27-33) can be dealt with more summarily. Whether the original story ended with the counter question in v.30, as has been argued<sup>(67)</sup>, or was handed down in its present form<sup>(68)</sup> is unimportant here, as is the original setting of the story and the reference to 'these things' (v.28). Mark links it with the cleansing of the temple and probably sees in it a veiled allusion to Jesus' divine authority<sup>(69)</sup>. The absence of positive teaching shows the central issue for Mark to be Christological.

The narrative concerning the tribute money (12:13-17) is the one most frequently regarded as containing ethical teaching by Jesus<sup>(70)</sup>. Most commentators hold that the issue of the relation of Christians to the state and the problem of paying the poll tax was of great importance both to the early Palestinian church before the Fall of Jerusalem and to the Christians elsewhere in the empire whose loyalty to Rome was being questioned<sup>(71)</sup>. It may well be that the story was retained in the tradition for the teaching which it seemed to give about this, but this does not mean that this was Mark's purpose in including it here. Two inter-related points should be noted. First, the pericope is set in a series of conflicts with opponents of which the overall theme is the failure of each successive group to trap Jesus and to weaken his standing with the people and his authority as messiah. Thus in a sense the message which Mark conveys is that which John states more explicitly when he records the words of Jesus, 'No one taketh (my life) away from me, but I lay it down of myself' (Jn 10:18). Houlden, who makes this point, adds that 'from this angle, the story shows Jesus both vindicating himself and at the same time facing his attackers with the demand and judgement of God'<sup>(72)</sup>. This interpretation is supported by the concluding comment in v.17, which, despite Bultmann's view that Mark's editorial work is to be found only in v.13, appears to be redactional<sup>(73)</sup>, for the amazement of the Pharisees and Herodians



is akin to Jesus' final routing of his critics in v.34b. Secondly, it is by no means certain that the saying in v.17 was understood by Mark as positive teaching about the Christian's relation to the state, similar to that of Paul in Rom 13:1-7. Different accounts have been offered of the meaning of the words in their original setting - that Jesus was simply evading a catch question intended either to prove him to be a rebel against Rome or to destroy his popularity with the crowd by showing that his questioners had themselves accepted Roman government and were using Roman money<sup>(74)</sup>; that Jesus held the quietist view that so long as the Roman state did not interfere with the religious and moral life of individuals it was essentially indifferent and taxes should be paid<sup>(76)</sup>; that the obligations to the state come within the divine order and are not inconsistent with loyalty to God<sup>(77)</sup>; that in the light of Jesus' expectation of an imminent end of the world when the political power of Rome would be destroyed, the answer reveals his view that the state possesses relative insignificance compared with the kingdom of God<sup>(78)</sup>; and that it is a sweeping away of the whole principle of ready made formulas which can be applied to any situation as it arises, the essential fact being that everything belongs to God<sup>(79)</sup>. Mark's concluding comment, however, suggests that he regarded the saying primarily as the means of escape from the trap which the Pharisees and Herodians had set. Thus in the overall setting of the gospel the pericope does not seem to have the purpose of presenting teaching by Jesus on an ethical and political issue<sup>(80)</sup>.

At first sight the question of the Sadducees about the resurrection (12:18-27) runs counter to the argument which has been presented. This debate has many parallels in rabbinic literature<sup>(81)</sup> and contains a proof of the resurrection and a description of the life which those who are raised will enjoy that are close to the kind of positive teaching noted in Matthew.

Few commentators go beyond considering the question of the original form of the pericope and the authenticity of the sayings, the beliefs of the Sadducees, and the meaning and cogency of the arguments which are put forward. Nineham, following Rawlinson, suggests that Jesus' statement in v.25 about the manner of the resurrection life would have had the greatest significance for



Mark's Roman readers 'as suggesting a spiritual view of the resurrection, free from the crudely materialistic traits which we know to have been a genuine stumbling-block to more spiritually minded "Greeks"' <sup>(82)</sup>. This assumes that Mark had as one of his aims the presentation of the teaching of Jesus, and we have found reason to doubt this. The overall setting is of great importance. Whether he obtained this group of conflict stories from an existing collection or compiled it himself <sup>(83)</sup>, it seems clear that Mark's primary concern is to show the failure of all the sects of Judaism to trap Jesus <sup>(84)</sup>. The key to the narrative is to be found in the final two words πολυ πλανατε, 'you are quite wrong'. This is not the admonition of a teacher but the triumphant climax of a battle in which Jesus utters his sayings with authority, authority such as Mark had earlier noted in 1:22, 27. Nineham sees the absence of any note of the people's reaction to Jesus' words as an indication that vv.26-27 may have replaced the original ending of the pericope <sup>(85)</sup>, but this is to misunderstand the way Mark has constructed this part of his gospel. He proceeds to the next episode by pointing out that the scribe who was to ask the final question recognized that Jesus had 'answered them well' (v.28) <sup>(86)</sup>, i.e. had routed his Sadducee rivals, and at the end of the pericope he brings the series of contests to a close with the statement that 'no man after that durst ask him any questions' (v.34). Thus Mark's purpose is plain and the teaching within the stories is incidental to it.

The pericope containing the discussion about the first commandment (12:28-34) is of central importance here since it contains what has generally been regarded as the main ethical and religious teaching of Jesus. The agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark <sup>(87)</sup>, the different form of the story in the three gospels, and the strikingly different setting given to the incident in Luke suggest that the history of the tradition and the relation between the three gospels are complex. Moreover, the different stress given to the teaching by the three evangelists is marked. Nevertheless, the overall similarities are too close for the view that the Lukan narrative refers to a separate occasion <sup>(88)</sup>. Arguments for the priority of the Markan or Lukan form of the story seem beside the point <sup>(89)</sup>. If the three accounts possess a common



ancestry the original situation is lost without trace and all that can be recovered is the approval of the combination of Deut 6:4-5 and Lev 19:18 by Jesus. In its present form the narratives reveal the interests of the gospel writers. As Furnish has shown, Luke is concerned with moral exhortation and the climax of his story comes at the end of the parable of the Good Samaritan which he attaches to the lawyer's question, 'Go, and do thou like-wise' (Lk 10:37). Matthew's version contains anti-Jewish polemic, its chief point being Mt 22:40, the two equal commandments constitute the law, or perhaps explain its meaning and give a true explanation of its demands<sup>(90)</sup>. Furnish finds the key to Mark's understanding of the story in the two sections not reproduced in the other two gospels, the Shema<sup>α</sup> (12:29b) and the scribe's reply with Jesus' commendation (12:32-34a)<sup>(91)</sup>. Both stress the affirmation that there is only one God and the second, restating the reply of Jesus that the love commandments constitute the first and second commandments of the law, emphasizes that these commandments are more important than the offering of sacrifices. Thus 'the overall point is just this: what is important for true religion is belief in and worship of the one God and obedience to the moral law, not religious ceremony or cultic performance'. Indeed, the use of *ἑὸς θεός* (v.30) and *ὁ κύριός* (v.33), coupled with *ἐπὶ ἑνὶ θεῷ* (v.32) and *ὁ κύριός* (v.34) give the Markan version a 'decidedly rationalistic aspect' which, together with the stress on monotheism, would have value in the context of Hellenistic-Jewish and Christian apologetic directed against Greek polytheism<sup>(92)</sup>. Further, the setting of the double commandment of love over against the cultic offering of sacrifices reveals another anti-pagan motif, to be seen in Aristeas: '(the highest form of glory is) to honour God, and this is done not with gifts and sacrifices but with purity of soul and holy conviction'<sup>(93)</sup>. Furnish summarizes as follows: 'The Markan version of the Great Commandment has been formulated for apologetic purposes. Its usefulness in early Christian missionary preaching is evident: there is One God. You must love him and your neighbour. Obedience to his will is more important than the performance of cultic ritual.' He adds that the tradition in Mark does not focus upon the meaning of love or on who the neighbour is, and there is no special concern for emphasizing



or defining the relationship between the two commandments. Rather the stress is laid upon the connection between believing in one God and obedience to the moral law<sup>(94)</sup>.

Since Markan redaction is found only in vv. 28a and 34b, Furnish maintains that this adaptation was pre-Markan and was taken over by him (though he presumably accepts that Mark approved of this interpretation). This is doubtful. Close attention should be given to some of the details in Mark's narrative. In the first place, he concludes the pericope with the statement that 'no man after that durst ask him any question' (v. 34b). This indicates that he linked this incident with the preceding conflict stories, despite the difference in form, and it marks a pause before the three final stories in this chapter (12:35-44)<sup>(95)</sup>. The first two of these are introduced by the statement that Jesus was teaching (12:35, 38) and they contain sayings addressed to the crowd (12:37). It is possible that Mark intended this comment to have a retrospective as well as a forward reference, and this may be supported by the repeated address of Jesus as διδάσκαλε in the series of pronouncement stories (12:14, 19, 32). The title is given to Jesus by the various opponents, however, and probably belongs to the traditional stories. Moreover, as has been shown, it is far from certain that διδάσκαλε/רַבִּי had in Mark's thought the full intellectual sense of the Greek word and may have been viewed by him as a polite form of address. This does not mean that the term as it occurred in the tradition had this connotation. The rabbinic cast of the stories has already been noted, but as Mark used them the title may not have implied that Jesus was giving teaching in these pericopae. Further, the distinction between the series of questions and the sayings which Mark introduces by the reference to Jesus as teaching is more clearly defined in Mark than in the other gospels. 'And no man after that durst ask him any question' has an air of finality and indicates that the next verse introduces a fresh section.

The present pericope concerning the love commandment was almost certainly preserved in the tradition because of its teaching, and Furnish presents a convincing account of the meaning in its pre-Markan form. It has often been noted that its form in Matthew and Luke, where it is a conflict story, would



suit Mark's purpose much better than the scholastic dialogue which he presents<sup>(96)</sup>, but by adding his concluding comment he treats it as if it were a conflict story. That he does not modify the narrative itself may indicate his fidelity to the tradition which he received. Viewed in its wider context, 11:27-12:34 presents Jesus as being challenged by all of the Jewish parties of which Mark takes note in his gospel and as decisively routing each of them. This is Mark's purpose. The fact that teaching is given is incidental, and the picture which he wishes to present is not that of Jesus the teacher, as the tradition may have done, but that of Jesus the victorious messiah<sup>(97)</sup>.

In the section of the gospel between these two groups of pronouncement stories there are relatively few sayings addressed to opponents, the chief being those contained in the pericopae concerning the accusation that Jesus was inspired by Beelzebub, the incident of the eating with unwashed hands, and the question about divorce, and these must now be considered.

The history of the tradition in Mk 3:20-35 is very complex. In view of Mark's well-known practice of inserting one story within another<sup>(98)</sup>, many hold that Mark regarded 'his people' (v.21) and the family of Jesus (v.31) as identical groups<sup>(99)</sup>. This may be so, but since different phrases are used and there is no indication that Jesus' mother and brothers came to him in vv.31-35 with the purpose of 'seizing' him, it is better to regard these two passages as distinct traditions, and since vv.20-21 contain no saying by Jesus, the latter section alone needs to be considered.

Cranfield makes a strenuous attempt to retain the original unity of 3:22-29<sup>(100)</sup> but none of his arguments appear convincing, and it is probable that Mark constructed the pericope from three distinct sayings, vv.23b-26, 27 and 28-29<sup>(101)</sup>. It is not clear whether Mark intended his comment in v.30 to refer to all three sayings or to restrict it to the last. The sayings appear to have different meanings. In the first reply, Jesus claims that the accusation that he is casting out the demons by the power of the prince of the demons presupposes civil war in Satan's kingdom and a speedy collapse of his power. V.27 is akin to the saying which precedes it in Matthew and Luke, 'If I by the spirit (finger) of God cast out the devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you (Mt 12:28, Lk 11:20), the main difference being that the Markan form is



parabolic and if allegorized would indicate a greater emphasis upon Jesus' own power over the demons. It may be stating that the eschatological conflict between Jesus and Satan has begun<sup>(102)</sup>. This is not the place to discuss the original form and meaning of the saying about the unforgivable sin, which appears in a different form in Mt 12:32 and in both a different form and context in Lk 12:10. Mark's concluding comment shows that he interpreted the accusation of the scribes as blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, presumably in the belief that Jesus was inspired by the Spirit. It is relatively simple, therefore, to follow Mark's thought here and it is unnecessary to ask whether the accusation of the scribes consists of one or two questions, or to suggest that if there are two, vv.22-27 answer the first and vv.28-29 the second. Mark appears to regard it as a single charge, and he evidently intended the passage in much the same way as Cranfield has interpreted it.

A major difficulty, however, is presented by Mark's redactional statement in v.23a, 'And he called them unto him, and said unto them in parables'. According to 4:11-12, 33-34, 'parables' were the method of teaching given to the crowd, and as previously argued, a parable for Mark was essentially an enigmatic saying which required explanation or divine enlightenment if it was to be understood. Here the parables are apparently addressed to the scribes<sup>(103)</sup>.

It is commonly assumed that 'them' in v.23 refers to the 'scribes which came down from Jerusalem'<sup>(104)</sup>, sharply distinguishing the pericope from the wider context. Moreover, the fact that vv.20-21 are not found in Matthew or Luke has tended to separate them off from the Beelzebub narrative. The structure of the passage, however, may be: vv.19b-20, Mark's general introduction; vv.21-22, accusations by οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ and the scribes from Jerusalem; vv.23b-29, sayings which answer both complaints. If so, 'them' in v.23a is Mark's editorial statement and could refer to the scribes alone, to the οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ together with the scribes, to the crowd, or to all three groups. In support of the last it may be noted that Mark never uses προσκαλεσθαι of hostile groups but only of the Twelve in 3:13; 6:7; 8:1; (8:34); 10:42 and 12:43, and in 7:14 (and partly in 8:34) of the crowd. This is admittedly not strong evidence, but if valid it eases the



problem of Mark's use of ἐν παραβολαῖς here, for these would then be addressed to the crowd. Moreover, there is a similar pattern in 7:1-15 where, after an altercation with the Pharisees and scribes, Jesus calls (προσκαλεσάμενος) the crowd and addresses a parable to them. Mark could then have regarded the pericope, despite its form, as teaching in parables given to the crowd. If that interpretation is rejected, we are left with parables addressed to opponents, and it is difficult to understand why Mark should have added this particular redactional passage (vv.19b-20, 23). The whole section, nevertheless, remains perplexing in being so similar to the conflict stories in which there is no teaching as Mark understood it.

The following episode, 3:31-35, is the only pronouncement story in Mark where the reply of Jesus is in response to a statement by members of the crowd. Since, however, it is set against the background of opposition to Jesus it may be included here. There is disagreement as to which saying is the core, Dibelius seeing it in v.34b, 'Behold, my mother and my brethren' <sup>(105)</sup>, and Bultmann in v.35, 'Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother' <sup>(106)</sup>, while Taylor argues for the pericope as a unity <sup>(107)</sup>. Mark in any case has included it in its present form, even if he has added an independent saying in the final verse.

It is usual to find positive teaching here, e.g. Branscomb points to the personal aspects of Jesus' conception of the kingdom <sup>(108)</sup>, Schmid and Mally, however, see a rigorous demand for commitment which transcends family ties <sup>(109)</sup>, and Schweizer declares that the central message is, 'Where Jesus is, there is salvation', so that the disciples are called to live as persons who have been in the presence of God <sup>(110)</sup>. These last interpretations would accord with the emphasis given by Mark to the rigorous call to discipleship, and attempts to discover a more positive and church ethic here are the result of reading these ideas into the passage. The will of God is the demand made by the kingdom. Even apart from the existentialist terms in which he expresses it, Schweizer's awareness may be accepted that prime importance is to be placed upon the relationship to Jesus, and that this relationship is here <sup>not</sup> the ethical quality and value of a family group' (Branscomb).

It is generally agreed that 7:1-23 is composite, although scholars differ as to the details of the component parts <sup>(111)</sup>.



The close parallels between this section and chapter 4 have been noted. Verse 15 is almost certainly an isolated saying, and is not to be linked with the question asked by the Pharisees in v.5, for not only are the two verses widely separated but they deal with different issues. Mark regards the saying in v.15 as enigmatic, being part of the teaching in parables which was given to the crowd and which needed to be explained to the disciples<sup>(112)</sup>. It might appear, therefore, that Mark has placed the stories and the sayings together because he thought that they dealt with similar matters, and if he regarded vv.14-23 as teaching in the sense that it is the explanation of a 'parable' it is awkward to argue for a different purpose in the preceding sections of the chapter. We should then be forced to agree with those who regard this as a compilation for catechetical purposes<sup>(113)</sup> and to concede that this is one of the more extended passages of instruction in Mark's gospel.

Nevertheless, it is questionable whether Mark intends vv.1-13 as teaching which has a direct bearing upon the lives of his readers. In the first place, the actions which are condemned are not merely Jewish, but, as is generally agreed, were practised only by the most rigorist Jews in Palestine. Indeed, there has been considerable debate as to whether the ritual washings in the extreme form in which Mark describes them were ever observed.<sup>(114)</sup> It is highly improbable that any group of Christians for whom Mark might conceivably have been writing would have been tempted to keep these traditions or would have been criticized by the Jews for failing to do so. Indeed, the fact that Mark has to explain the hand-washing shows that this was not a live issue for his readers. Secondly, as has frequently been observed, the Isaiah quotation with its introduction and conclusion is no answer to the Pharisees' question but represents the type of comment about the religious practice of the Pharisees and the failure of the Jews to accept the Christian faith which is found elsewhere in the gospels and other New Testament writings<sup>(115)</sup>. Thirdly, the section on corban provides no answer to the original question either, but deals with a separate issue, and the only positive teaching which can be extracted from it is that Christians should keep at least the ten commandments and possibly also the whole Mosaic law, which they certainly did not do in Mark's day<sup>(116)</sup>. This passage, in fact, consists of stock anti-Pharisaic polemic.



Its purpose is not to teach Christians how they should live, but to present the hostile stance of later Christianity towards the Jews. Jesus is depicted as utterly rejecting Judaism and this is done by means of a caricature of Jewish ritual observance. The tone is not as extreme as is found in the Didache, but it is not very far removed from it<sup>(117)</sup>.

The debate about divorce (10:2-12) presents more problems for our subject than any other pronouncement story in Mark. It is not clear why Mark placed it in its present position within the central section of the gospel (8:27 - 10:52)<sup>(118)</sup>. Lightfoot suggested that there is an allusion to Israel as the bride of Christ (cf. Is 50:1 and 62:4-5) and that Jesus, having referred to himself as the bridegroom in 2:19, had to decide at this stage of the drama and in face of the hostility of the Jews in the south (3:22; 7:1) whether he would maintain the union with his people at all costs, however they might treat him<sup>(119)</sup>. There is, however, no hint in the text that this underlies the narrative. Schweizer sees the whole section (10:1-31) as having the characteristics of a catechism and compares catechetical passages in the epistles (1 Tim 2:8 - 3:13; 5:1 - 6:2; Tit 1:5-9; 2:2-10; Eph 5:22 - 6:9; 1 Pet 2:13 - 3:7; 5:1-5). He claims that the section sets out 'discipleship in marriage, discipleship as it relates to children, and discipleship as it relates to possessions'<sup>(120)</sup>. This fails to explain the crowd setting (10:1) and the different types of material which have been assembled in this chapter and to account for Mark's comment that the Pharisees were 'tempting' Jesus. Moreover, to say that the passage is 'representative of the kind of controversy in which the church frequently was engaged, as e.g. in its quarrel with Judaism' lacks solid evidence. 1 Cor 7 shows that questions of marriage and divorce were live issues in Corinth, as Schweizer notes, but this was in a pagan situation. We know about debates on divorce among the schools of Hillel and Shammai, but possess little knowledge of Jewish-Christian debate on this issue.

In the form in which Mark presents the incident it is a conflict story, hence the characterisation of the Pharisees' action as *πειρασμός* Jesus<sup>(121)</sup>. This places it alongside the episodes of the tribute money (12:13-17) and the request for a sign (8:11-12). J.M. Robinson sees this reference to 'temptation' as a ground for the assimilation of the conflict stories to the exorcisms<sup>(122)</sup>, and



even if his thesis as a whole is unacceptable in finding the central theme of Mark's gospel as the eschatological struggle of Jesus with evil, this is a valuable insight into one important purpose of the conflict stories. We should hesitate, therefore, to assume that Mark intended to present positive ethical teaching here. Matthew, who is legislating for the church, makes important changes in the narrative - adding *κατὰ παρὰν ἀτίαν* (Mt 19:3), transferring the Genesis quotation to the lips of Jesus, placing the discussion of Deut 24:1-4 at a later point in the debate, and adding the exceptive clause (Mt 19:9) - and in this way making of it a discussion about the grounds for divorce and giving the answer of Jesus the character of a legal pronouncement<sup>(123)</sup>.

Had the narrative in Mark ended at v.9 the only difficulty would have been to determine its place in the overall framework of the gospel. Mark, however, adds private teaching by Jesus given 'in the house' to the disciples. This puts the passage in the same class as the explanations of the parable of the Sower (4:13-20, cf. 34), of uncleanness (7:18-23) and of the parousia (13:5-37), and suggests that Mark understood the replies of Jesus to the Pharisees as a divine revelation which was hidden from all except those to whom God chose to make it plain and that he did not intend the pericope to be understood primarily as a conflict in which the Pharisees were discomfited. If this is so, vv.11-12 must be taken as positive teaching in the same way as 7:18-23.

As so often with Mark, the evidence cannot be forced into a neat scheme. It has already been noted that Mark's theory of the purpose of parables fits the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen rather awkwardly and that no fully consistent pattern of his use of the words *διδασκεῖν* and *διδάχειν* can be discerned. It now appears that, while Mark generally uses the pronouncement stories less for the positive teaching which they contain than for their value as depicting the supremacy of Jesus over all his opponents, this interpretation does not fit the debate about divorce. Perhaps this indicates that we have been expecting more from the form of the teaching than is legitimate and that more is to be gained from the content of Jesus' message<sup>(124)</sup>.



Addendum - The Rich Man (10:17-22)

It is not easy to decide at what point this pericope should be considered. It is in the form of a pronouncement story<sup>(125)</sup>. The rich man is not one of the Twelve, and although he might be classed as a would-be disciple, he finally turns away and does not follow Jesus. Like the question concerning the greatest commandment, the episode draws from Jesus a positive response to the Old Testament laws, in particular to the continuing validity of the decalogue, yet Jesus goes beyond these commandments and calls for poverty and personal adherence to himself. Like that incident also is the welcome which Jesus gives to the questioner - here Mark records that Jesus loved the man<sup>(126)</sup>, there Jesus tells the scribe that he is not far from the kingdom of God. Yet there are contrasts in the way Mark uses the two incidents. The answer of Jesus to the question about the greatest commandment is placed at the end of a series of interrogations in which Jesus effectively routs his opponents, and even the final words of approval to the scribe are followed immediately by the statement that after this reply of Jesus no one dared to ask him any further questions. The theme of conflict is dominant in the whole of this section. In chapter 10, however, the story of the rich man leads on to an extended discussion about riches which is probably a Markan compilation<sup>(127)</sup>. These additions contain teaching given to the disciples in a form akin to the pronouncement stories. Thus while the pericope has similarities with those conflict stories which appear to have been used by Mark less for their teaching than for their value as revealing the power of Jesus, it also has similarities with the debate about divorce, where the replies to the opponents lead on to positive teaching given privately to the disciples.

Yet Mark does not go as far in didactic emphasis as Matthew, as R.P. Martin has suggested<sup>(128)</sup>, and apparently includes the incident less for its ethical teaching than for its congruence with the theme of a call to rigorous discipleship which is prepared to reject all earthly ties for the sake of following Jesus, and which may well lead to persecution. What is found here is less positive teaching than exhortation to practise a form of discipleship which is already known<sup>(129)</sup>.



Mark 4:11-12 is central to any study of the teaching of Jesus in Mark's gospel. These verses have already been considered in connection with their form; it is now necessary to examine the content. With respect to this two questions in particular arise: What did Mark understand by the phrase, 'the mystery of the kingdom of God'? and in what way is the explanation of the parable of the Sower related both to the 'mystery' and to the understanding of parables generally<sup>(1)</sup>.

Surprisingly, many commentators appear to be quite certain of the meaning of the phrase, 'the mystery of the kingdom of God', for the most part interpreting it as either the fact that the kingdom entered into history in the ministry of Jesus or as the secret that Jesus was the messiah, while sometimes these two interpretations are combined.

Representative examples of the first interpretation are as follows. 'The secret of the kingdom of God means the "mystery" that in and through the ministry of Jesus the kingdom of God is breaking into history' (Nineham)<sup>(2)</sup>. 'Das Geheimnis liegt darin, dass der "andere Aon", dass die neue Welt Gottes schon Gegenwart geworden ist' (Schniewind)<sup>(3)</sup>. '"The secret of the kingdom of God" which constitutes God's gift must not be understood as implying general revelations about the coming kingdom of God, but, as the singular shows, a particular revelation, namely the recognition of its present irruption' (Jeremias)<sup>(4)</sup>. 'Das Geheimnis des Gottesreiches ist ... das Geheimnis der anbrechenden eschatologischen Stunde und des eschatologischen Boten, der Jesus ist' (Grundmann)<sup>(5)</sup>. (The mystery is) 'the knowledge that God's kingdom has irrupted with Jesus, the hidden Messiah, along with the reversal of values that his coming effects' (Mally)<sup>(6)(7)</sup>.

For the interpretation that the secret is that Jesus is the Messiah pride of place must naturally be given to Wrede: 'A chief part of this mystery is to the effect that Jesus is the messiah, the Son of God'<sup>(8)</sup>. Other examples of this interpretation are these. 'It is the secret that the kingdom of God has come in the person and words and works of Jesus ... the secret of the kingdom of God is the



secret of the person of Jesus' (Cranfield)<sup>(9)</sup>. 'Paulinisch ausgedrückt ist es der *λογος του σταυρου* der verkündigt wird; oder, wie bereits Wrede und Jülicher ausgelegt haben: Die Verkündigung hat Jesus als den Messias zum Inhalt' (Marxsen)<sup>(10)</sup>. 'It appears, therefore, that St. Mark in 4:11 is not thinking of the kingdom of God in any abstract sense, whether as a future or as a present reality, but of the kingdom as it is embodied in the person of Jesus the Messiah. In other words, the reference is to the saving message of the apostolic preaching or the essential content of the church's gospel' (Burkill)<sup>(11)(12)</sup>.

No real alternative to these views has been put forward, although there is a certain amount of modification by some writers. Thus de Tillesse notes two features of the *μυστηριον* in Paul, 'd'une part le mystère s'identifie à la personne de Jésus-Christ; second trait: le mystère est identique à l'Évangile', and then proceeds, 'Les deux traits se retrouvent chez Marc. Pour lui aussi, le contenu de l'Évangile, tout comme celui du mystère, c'est le Royaume de Dieu (Mc 1:14-15 et 4:11). Le "mystère" qu'il annonce est "la Parole", c'est-à-dire l'Évangile'<sup>(13)</sup>. Best holds that the present position of 4:11-12 is due to Mark and here the verses must be understood to mean that God has given to the disciples (including believers of Mark's own day) the mystery of the kingdom, but that the parables in which it is unveiled to them conceal its meaning from non-believers. From the parables in the chapter, therefore, we learn that the kingdom belongs to the future though the steps which bring it in have already been taken<sup>(14)</sup>. Reploh distinguishes between the original meaning of the 'mystery' as the present coming of the kingdom in the words and deeds of Jesus and the meaning in the Gemeinde as Jesus himself<sup>(15)</sup>.

Almost all these writers are strongly influenced by Wrede's concept of the messianic secret or by the concept of realized eschatology associated with C.H. Dodd. Apart, however, from these preconceptions, the *μυστηριον της βασιλειας του Θεου* can by no means be so clearly defined. Thus Quesnell has drawn attention to a number of surprising features here. He notes that most scholars have been content to ask what each of the redactors of Mark 4 have meant by what they have added, and that few have gone on to enquire what background of thought enabled them to make these changes or



what effect they intended by these changes on the chapter as a whole and on the readers of the complete work. In his analysis of 4:1-34 he makes the following points. In vv.10-12 Mark introduces το μυστήριον της βασιλείας του Θεου for the first and only time in his gospel and without any explanation, as if it were something well known to his readers. These verses suggest that he expected his readers to feel that they were being admitted into a great secret of some kind which had previously been reserved for the Twelve. Further, the shift from 'parable' to 'parables' in v.13 is not a mere remnant of earlier stages in the development of the chapter but affirms a connection between 'knowing this parable' and 'knowing all the parables', while the elaborate explanation of the Sower in vv. 14-20, within which 'the word' is left unexplained, raises the question of the extent to which Mark believed that the 'mystery of the kingdom' which was given to the disciples consisted of this application of the parable<sup>(16)</sup>. This is perceptive and, with whatever reservations about certain other features in his thesis, may provide a starting point for discussion.

The actual phrase το μυστήριον της βασιλείας του Θεου is unique in the New Testament, although its component parts are frequently found elsewhere, μυστήριον more commonly in the Pauline writings, βασιλεία chiefly in the synoptic gospels. Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in rendering by ὑμῖν δοδοται γινωσκετε τα μυστήρια της βασιλείας των οὐρανῶν (του Θεου). However this agreement is accounted for, its effect is to lay more stress in these gospels upon the teaching of Jesus. Thus in the view of Bornkamm, Matthew's use of the plural in contrast to the singular 'obviously refers to the teaching of Jesus'<sup>(17)</sup>, and G. Barth observes, 'Whether the plural μυστήρια is provided by Matthew it is not possible to say with certainty since Luke also has the plural; but at least it corresponds to the comprehensive meaning of the object of the understanding; the μυστήρια are obviously for Matthew doctrines; it is not only, as in Mark, the fact of the irruption of the βασιλεία that is intended'<sup>(18)</sup>. Nevertheless, it is not certain that all thought of knowledge or teaching is excluded from Mark. The μυστήριον is such as could be imparted through instruction, and even Bornkamm and Barth interpret it as knowledge, although of a different object in Mark from that in Matthew. What is given is not the kingdom but the mystery of the



kingdom, a secret of some kind which is revealed to the disciples.

The background of the word *μυστηριον* has frequently been examined <sup>(19)</sup>, and for its meaning in Mark two facts appear to be decisive. The idea of 'hardening' is akin to Paul's theory of divine purpose behind the failure of the Jews to accept Jesus (e.g. in Rom 9-11), and, as will be shown later, Mark's gospel is strongly controlled by an eschatology leading up to the parousia. Whether the word *μυστηριον* was widely used in the Hellenistic religions of the day, with an emphasis upon esoteric knowledge restricted to the initiates, so that 'the present passage would be bound to suggest this analogy to Gentile readers' has been contested <sup>(20)</sup>. The underlying thought in these verses seems to be that God has a pre-determined plan of history which he reveals to those whom he chooses. This, however, only provides the setting. For the content of the secret the meaning of *μυστηριον* in Paul or the apocalypses cannot be simply taken over; the word needs to be examined in relation both to Mark's use of 'the kingdom of God' and to his wider eschatology.

Mark uses the term *ἡ βασιλεια του Θεου* 14 times, all but one (15:43) in sayings of Jesus. Of these, eight are addressed to the disciples alone (4:11; 9:47; 10:14, 15, 23, 24, 25; 14:25), one is spoken to the disciples with the crowd (9:1), one is unambiguously directed to the crowd (1:15), while in 4:26, 30 changes of audience within the chapter make it uncertain who is addressed; one is addressed to a friendly scribe (12:34). Three of the sayings (1:15; 9:1; 14:25) speak of an event which is still future <sup>(21)</sup>, and this is also the sense in the statement that Joseph of Arimathaea was 'looking for the kingdom of God' (15:43). Two sayings (4:11 and 10:14) are so ambiguous that they can be interpreted only in the light of general considerations derived from the other references in Mark, and 4:26 and 30 introduce parables which themselves are of uncertain meaning. The remaining sayings speak of 'entering' (9:47; 10:15, 23-24, 25) or being 'not far from' the kingdom (12:34). Of these last there is such a wide range of interpretations - the kingdom as having come in the lifetime of Jesus <sup>(22)</sup>, as the acknowledgement of God's sovereignty <sup>(23)</sup>, as realm <sup>(24)</sup>, as salvation <sup>(25)</sup>, as future <sup>(26)</sup> - that the only way forward would seem to lie in moving away from the older exegesis, which has treated each saying



in isolation and has taken as its starting point questions of authenticity. This approach involved extracting from all three synoptic gospels those sayings which happen to contain the phrase and largely to neglect the contexts. It is doubtful whether this opens the way back to the message of Jesus, and it has certainly made it impossible to understand the eschatology of the gospel writers. Mark has inserted these sayings into larger contexts, and on the assumption that they had meaning for him in these settings they have to be examined within his final redaction as a whole. Further the practice of treating 'the kingdom of God', 'the Son of man' and other such terms separately is to be avoided, since it rests on the assumption, itself very doubtful, that they were technical terms with a fixed and narrow meaning. Moreover, it could lead to a distortion of Mark's eschatology, for while it is the case that no single saying combines the kingdom of God and the Son of man, or even the passion and the parousia of the Son of man, they are, nevertheless, closely connected in the material as Mark has presented it.

The key passage which raises these issues is 8:27 - 9:1<sup>(27)</sup>. In Mark's gospel this is a unity, separated off from the surrounding narratives by the journey to the villages of Caesarea Philippi (8:27) and the mysterious 'six days' which elapse before the Transfiguration (9:2)<sup>(28)</sup>. What is it intended to convey as a whole? According to Nineham it has been constructed by Mark to bring out three important truths: that Jesus is the messiah but only if that term is understood in the sense of the suffering Son of man; that the disciples' failure to understand Jesus' teaching about suffering is a sign of the hardening of their hearts and their domination by the power of Satan; and that this is what is required whenever Jesus is recognized as the messiah and to know this is a gift of God in Christ<sup>(29)</sup>. M.D. Hooker points to the linking of the sufferings of the Son of man with the suffering which Jesus' followers will have to undergo, and the appearance of the Son of man with the vindication of the elect<sup>(30)</sup>. This goes part of the way, but there is need to go further. For doing so the starting point is Mark's evident identification of Jesus with the Son of man<sup>(31)</sup>. Despite any appearance to the contrary suggested by the form of the words in vv. 31 and 38, Mark understands



Jesus to be speaking about himself, and he knows that Jesus is the Son of God the Father. Around these two truths the main themes of the passage coalesce in the following manner. (1) Jesus is named as the messiah and identifications with Elijah and John the Baptist are firmly rejected (8:27-29); (2) he foretells his sufferings and death and his resurrection 'after three days' (8:31); (3) underlying this prediction is a theme of predestination, almost determinism - the Son of man 'must suffer' (8:31); (4) Peter's rebuke of Jesus apparently for saying that suffering was the predestined lot of the messiah/Son of man is met with uncommon sternness as an attack by Satan (8:33); (5) this is followed by a call to rigorous discipleship, expressed in terms of taking up a cross and losing one's life for the sake of Jesus and the gospel and not being ashamed of Jesus and his 'words' (8:34-38); (6) a climax is reached with the threat of the coming Son of man in the glory of his Father and the promise that 'some here of them that stand by' shall see the kingdom of God 'come with power' (8:38 - 9:1); and finally, (7) 8:30 contains the theme of the 'messianic secret' with the command to tell no-one who Jesus is.

All these themes are prominent elsewhere in the gospel. With respect to the first, the Christological emphasis of Mark has been stressed so often that there is no need to argue the fact that this is a major concern with him. Rather it is the form of this Christology which needs to be observed. Despite the persistence of the term 'messianic secret' Schulz is surely correct that we should speak rather of a 'Gottessohngeheimnis'<sup>(32)</sup>. The word 'Christ' is rarely used in Mark as a clear term of approbation, and in the present passage it is not picked up by Jesus, who immediately substitutes the Son of man.<sup>(33)</sup> At the trial before the Sanhedrin the high priest asks Jesus if he is 'the Christ, the Son of the Blessed' (14:61). Since it seems unlikely that the 'Son of God' was a title for the messiah in first century Palestine, and 'the Blessed' was not the usual circumlocution for God<sup>(34)</sup>, this may be a Christianized version of the high priest's question and for Mark the title would have its full Christian sense. Thus 'the messiah' is glossed here as 'the Son of God' and Jesus again is made to substitute the 'Son of man'. In the apocalyptic chapter 'Lo here is the Christ' is the cry of those who follow



'false Christs' (13:21, cf. v.22) and the true deliverer is named as the Son of man (13:26, cf. 8:29, 31 and 14:61-62). In 1:1 Jesus Christ is used as a proper name, as in the Pauline writings, and the same is probably the case with the difficult  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  in 9:41, the anarthrous form not found elsewhere in Mark<sup>(35)</sup>. This essentially involves treating it as a proper name (as in Rom 8:9; 1 Cor 1:12; 3:23; 2 Cor 10:7) and is not to be taken as an example of Mark's recognition of 'the Christ' as a title of Jesus. This means that it goes beyond the evidence to suggest that Mark understood the perception of the demons in 1:34 to be that Jesus was the Messiah, as Taylor asserts<sup>(36)</sup>. Where Mark records the actual words of the demons it is as 'Thou art the Son of God' (3:11; 5:7)<sup>(37)</sup>.

This is how Mark understands the person of Jesus, whether  $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  is read in 1:1 or not. The title 'the Son of God' is found a further eight times in the gospel, all in highly significant contexts. At the baptism and the Transfiguration (1:11; 9:7) Jesus is addressed or referred to as  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . The question of the high priest is whether Jesus is the 'Son of the Blessed' (14:61), and Jesus appears to accept this, although he immediately substitutes 'Son of man'<sup>(38)</sup>. The centurion at the cross makes what Mark probably regarded as the Christian confession 'Truly this man was a Son of God' (15:39). In the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, which Mark certainly saw as containing a direct reference to the crucifixion, the owner has one  $\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon$  (12:6), while in 13:32 'the Son' is used in a quasi-Johannine way as a correlative of 'the Father'<sup>(39)</sup>. Thus Mark not merely prefers the titles 'the Son of man' and 'the Son of God' but seems to be deliberately rejecting the idea that Jesus is the messiah. It may be that he did this for the benefit of Gentile readers who would not understand the Jewish term, but the consistency with which he appears to oppose it suggests that he had a stronger motive. He seems to have held that 'the Christ' contained overtones which were false to his understanding of the person of Jesus and to his eschatology. It is thus of profound significance that in 8:38 it is the Son of man who comes in the glory of his Father, for it means that for Mark associations belonging to the title 'the Son of man' have been overridden by his conviction that Jesus is the Son of God.



The second and third themes, Jesus' prediction of his passion and resurrection with their underlying determinism, may be considered together. The predictions are repeated in 9:31 and 10:33-34, and along with them may be included the conversation in 9:9-13 and the quotation from Zech 13:7 in 14:27-28. It is also a prominent theme in the passion narrative (14:21, 27-31, cf. 16:7 'as he said unto you'). One of the purposes which such predictions serve is to emphasize that the death of Jesus was in accord with the will of God and had been both foreseen and planned. Emphasis is placed upon this and at times an almost deterministic note enters in. Thus the summary statement in 8:31 has 'he began to teach them that the Son of man must ( $\delta\epsilon\iota$ )<sup>(40)</sup> suffer many things'. The same verb is used by the disciples in 9:11 of the teaching of the scribes about Elijah, and despite obscurities in the sequence of thought in 9:9-13 it seems sufficiently clear that Mark identifies John the Baptist with Elijah and thus points to his death as the working out of the predetermined sequence of events which would lead on to the suffering of the Son of man. R.H. Lightfoot's statement that here 'we may perhaps see the church striving to construct some kind of a philosophy of history, in the light of its convictions about the person and office of its Master'<sup>(41)</sup> comes near to this. The same verb ( $\delta\epsilon\iota$ ) is also found in the apocalyptic chapter (13:7, 10), also to emphasize the necessity for the predicted events to occur as they are foretold. With this may be included the statement in 10:40 that the places at the right and left of Jesus in his kingdom are for those 'for whom it hath been prepared', where, despite Taylor's disavowal<sup>(42)</sup>, the same idea of predestination appears. The introduction to the third prediction of the passion contains the same idea: he 'began to tell them the things that were to happen unto him' (10:32), and the fact that Jesus could give detailed predictions of the subsequent events (e.g. Peter's denial, 14:30) serves to emphasize this.

Three other devices are used to indicate the way in which the suffering and resurrection of Jesus are part of a divine plan. The first has already been noted, the reference to the coming of Elijah. Although not stated explicitly, the expectation is evidently based upon Mal 4:5-6 (Hebrew 3:23-24), and elsewhere, especially in the passion narrative, the fulfilment of scripture is underlined (9:12;



14:21, 27, 49). Secondly, in 14:35 Mark has Jesus pray that 'the hour' (ἡ ὥρα) might pass from him, and in 14:41 Jesus states that 'the hour' has come. As in the somewhat similar usage in John (cf. Jn 2:4; 7:30; 12:23, 27), the word seems to have belonged to the vocabulary of apocalyptic<sup>(43)</sup>, but in Mark here, and also in John, it is made to refer to the delivering up of the Son of man and thus to the drama which led to the crucifixion and resurrection. It is closely akin to ὁ καιρὸς in 1:15 and to 'that day and that hour' in 13:32, and belongs to the circle of ideas connected with the predetermined eschatological events. Thirdly, considerable stress is laid upon the validity of the teaching of Jesus concerning the passion and the resurrection. As Nineham comments on the voice at the Transfiguration (9:7), 'Jesus' teaching that he must suffer is shown to be fully in accordance with the will of God by a voice from God himself which designates him as the one whose teaching God wants all men to accept'<sup>(44)</sup>. In 16:7 the young man at the tomb reminds the women of the teaching of Jesus given to the Twelve at 14:28. This emphasis, it has to be noted, is upon the words of Jesus, not as moral instruction but as teaching of a prophetic character.

There is, then, some evidence that Mark was influenced by apocalyptic ideas and that he took over predestinarian views of the future as already determined, so that what has been forefold must simply unfold<sup>(45)</sup>.

The fourth theme in 8:27 - 9:1 is the almost savage rebuke given to Peter, 'Get thee behind me, Satan'. J.M. Robinson holds that this places the conflict between the two views of the character and activity of the messiah/Son of man in the framework of the conflict between Jesus and the forces of evil<sup>(46)</sup>. His contention is that conflict with Satan which is introduced at the beginning of the gospel in the very compressed reference to the temptation (1:13) is worked out in the exorcisms and other miracles (e.g. 1:23-27, 32-34; 4:35-41; 5:1-20) and in the conflict stories which are so prominent in this gospel and the debates with the disciples which follow the three predictions of the passion (8:32 - 9:1; 9:33-50; 10:35-45), and is emphasized by a number of references to 'temptation' (8:11; 10:2; 12:15; 14:38). Best rejects this interpretation and denies that the words of 8:33 imply that Peter is indwelt by



Satan or has become Satan's tool. In accordance with his own view that in Mark Satan has already been defeated by Jesus in the temptation and remained bound during his ministry (cf. 3:23-27), he takes 8:33 to mean that Peter is behaving after the manner of Satan and that his thoughts are 'human' rather than in line with God's plans<sup>(47)</sup>. As it is impossible to decide between these rival interpretations without considering Mark's total eschatological view, further discussion is postponed until later.

The fifth theme in this section is the definition of discipleship in terms of suffering and the cross. M.D. Hooker has pointed out that, while the Son of man is not used in Mark to denote a corporate entity but only an individual, the consequences of this individual's authority always extend to others, and in the predictions of the suffering of the Son of man Jesus is linked with his followers who are to share both his suffering and his glory<sup>(48)</sup>. Put in a slightly different way, this means that one of the main themes of Mark's gospel is the call to rigorous discipleship. In this passage this is expressed as the demand to deny oneself and take up one's cross, to be ready to lose one's life for the sake of Jesus and the gospel, and not to be ashamed of Jesus (8:33-38). In the following chapter there is the stern warning to those who 'cause one of these little ones that believe on me to stumble', and the demand to cut off hand, foot or eye if these cause one to stumble and thus bring one in danger of hell (9:42-48), while in chapter 10 a series of warnings is given about riches (10:21-22, 23-31) followed by the saying about drinking the cup which Jesus is to drink and being baptised with his baptism (10:38-39) and leading up to the call to service (10:42-45). Quesnell speaks of these exhortations as 'universal moral directives' and emphasizes that they 'stand in a clear and definite relationship to the impending fate of suffering, death and resurrection'<sup>(49)</sup>. We would wish to go beyond this in two directions. Firstly, as we have already seen, the 'universal moral directives' are closely integrated into a much wider complex of ideas which are more than teaching and are an expression of a total eschatological event. This will be traced out in more detail later. Secondly, the phrase 'moral directives' is too general. What is the precise ethical content of such 'directives', if any? The answer to this question depends



to some extent on the two remaining themes discerned in 8:27 - 9:1.

Despite the fact that the passion and parousia of the Son of man are never mentioned together in any one logion<sup>(50)</sup>, in the single unitary section under consideration both are to be found. Indeed, these are so closely interwoven that the parousia in 8:38 is given as the sanction of the call to rigorous discipleship and suffering in vv. 34-37 and itself speaks of the refusal of some to go along with the earthly Jesus. Further, the two types of Son of man sayings are far less distinct than many scholars have supposed and the passion sayings contain the belief in the ultimate vindication of the Son of man in terms of the resurrection, while vice versa the parousia sayings are found in contexts concerned with suffering<sup>(51)</sup>. The combination of suffering and vindication or of parousia with suffering can be seen in such passages as 9:9-13; 10:32-45, and in 13:26 coming at the end of a series of 'messianic woes', or in 14:17-28 where the sufferings of the Son of man are found in close association with the new wine of the kingdom of God and the promise that Jesus will 'go before' his disciples into Galilee, or in 14:41 and 62 set in the context of the passion. Whether there is a common theme to be found running through all the Son of man sayings, e.g. in the idea of the authority of the Son of man, is questionable. And, as has already been argued, there are serious dangers of distortion when verses are isolated from their contexts and discussed in rather arbitrary groupings based on the presence of supposed technical terms. More significant is the fact that themes found in such a section as 8:27 - 9:1 cohere in a single complex of ideas and that within this the suffering and triumph of Jesus as the Son of man are important and are joined to the thought of the future coming of the kingdom of God and the suffering which Jesus' followers will have to endure.

Finally the theme of the messianic secret represented in the command to tell no-one of Jesus' messiahship (8:30) cannot be overlooked. From Wrede to Burkill this has been a ruling idea and a main point of discussion in attempts to understand the meaning of Mark's gospel as a whole. Some hesitation may be expressed about its centrality in Mark's thought and in the literature the term 'the messianic secret' is used to cover a range of ideas, from that of Wrede that Mark used it to explain the fact that Jesus was not



recognized as the messiah during his earthly life, through that of Taylor that there was a genuine reserve in Jesus' acceptance of the title of messiah, to more recent redactional views that it derives not from historical circumstances but from Mark's theological presentation of his gospel<sup>(52)</sup>.

Thus from an examination of this section of Mark's gospel it becomes evident that Mark believed the total event of the end-time to have arrived. Although J.M. Robinson has overstressed the importance of the cosmic struggle, in this he is surely correct when he writes: 'Mark sees the history of Jesus from an eschatological perspective. For Mark the driving force in history is the divine power of the end of time, operative already in the history of Jesus, propelling the whole course of history towards its ultimate destiny'<sup>(53)</sup>. The history which Mark records is a unity beginning from John the Baptist<sup>(54)</sup>. Very doubtful, however, is Robinson's judgement that 'in the resurrection the force of evil is conclusively broken and the power of God's reign is established in history' and that 'history since the resurrection is conceived of as a continuation of the same cosmic struggle which Jesus began'<sup>(55)</sup>, for the parousia and the coming of the kingdom of God 'with power' are much more integral parts of the single event of the end-time than such a reading of Mark in terms of Luke-Acts allows. John the Baptist, the ministry of Jesus, the crucifixion, the resurrection and the parousia are all constituents of this single event which involves suffering and vindication. In a sense the Baptist, Jesus, and the disciples all suffer the same experiences. The Baptist's sufferings are emphasized by Mark more than by the other evangelists<sup>(56)</sup>. Matthew and Luke develop the preaching of John (cf. Mk 1:7-8; Mt 3:7-12; Lk 3:7-17) and include the incident of John's sending his disciples to Jesus and Jesus' subsequent commendation of John (Mt 11:2-19/Lk 7:18-35; cf. also Mt 21:32; Lk 7:29-30). Mark has none of this but gives a full account of John's imprisonment and death (6:17-29) which Matthew abbreviates considerably (Mt 14:3-12) and Luke omits altogether. Further, in 9:10-12, despite the awkward sequence of thought, it is clear that Mark identified the Baptist with Elijah already come, and does so in such a way as to lay a certain stress upon the fate of John and also that it was in accordance with scriptural prophecy. In its present form the pericope makes John's



coming comparable to that of Jesus in that a divine necessity (δε v.11) shown in a scripturally foretold sequence of events unfolds in the fate of both persons. A second hint of this may be seen in the use of the verb <sup>παρουσθηναι</sup> /in 1:14 (cf. 9:31), which could have been intended in a purely secular sense, but which may well have the overtones of God's purpose lying behind the death of both John and Jesus<sup>(57)</sup>.

We have already noted sections in the gospel where exhortations to rigorist discipleship are linked with statements about the Son of man. These same sections also contain pointers to final vindication and triumph. Those who lose their life for the sake of Jesus and the gospel will save it (8:35), and the Son of man will not be ashamed of them when he comes in the glory of his Father (8:38). Those who sacrifice hand, foot, or eye will enter the kingdom of God (9:43-48). To leave house, brethren and lands for Jesus and the gospel brings rewards and eternal life (10:29-30), and while to drink the cup of Jesus and receive his baptism do not guarantee the places at his right and left, it is implied that rewards are prepared for Jesus' followers in the kingdom (10:38-40). The most important section of the gospel, however, in this respect is the apocalyptic chapter thirteen. Here is a combination of prediction, exhortation and promise. The conflict with the forces of evil will lead to a time of great distress (the messianic woes) but to those who 'watch' the Son of man will come and gather 'his elect' into the heavenly kingdom.

Thus there is a predetermined pattern of suffering and vindication revealed in three cycles, each more widely embracing than the previous one. The predestined sufferings of the Baptist alone are mentioned without vindication, unless the presence of Elijah at the transfiguration (9:4-5) is to be regarded as such. Jesus suffers and is raised from the dead, and is expected to come again in final triumph at the parousia. The faithful disciples suffer and are linked with the triumphant Son of man in the parousia and the coming of the kingdom with power.

It appears, therefore, that the 'mystery of the kingdom of God' is too narrowly understood when it is defined in terms of the messianic secret. Mark has in mind the total eschatological event which includes at least the themes which are found in 8:27 - 9:1 and which are leading ideas in the rest of the gospel. If this is



established, the relation of the interpretation of the parable of the Sower to the 'mystery' becomes easier to discern, so long as we are content to accept what Mark has written and not to try to discover the 'real' meaning of the parable.

Here what has become the standard approach to this parable tends to be a hindrance rather than a help to discernment of Mark's own intention, since it starts from the assumption that the interpretation has misunderstood the true teaching of Jesus<sup>(58)</sup>. Thus Dodd bids us forget the interpretation entirely<sup>(59)</sup>, and Jeremias says, 'In order to understand the parable of the Sower ... in what is probably its original meaning, we must reject the interpretation which misses its eschatological point, shifts its emphasis from the eschatological to the psychological and hortatory aspect, and turns it into a warning to the converted against a failure to stand fast in time of persecution and against worldliness'<sup>(60)</sup>. But what if this is precisely the point that Mark is making? If the interpretation is read carefully it will be observed that all the stress lies upon the seeds which failed to produce a harvest and that it is, in Jeremias' words, an exhortation. Even Quesnell has only partly grasped this point. He notes correctly that the emphasis lies on receiving the word with joy and avoiding the dangers of Satan's taking it away, of 'stumbling' in tribulation and persecution, and of letting the word be choked by riches, the cares of the world and desires for other things, but he interprets this in line with his overall thesis that the first part of the gospel is a preparation for the revelation in the latter part, and so as simply intensifying the expectation of 4:11-13<sup>(61)</sup>.

A clue to a correct understanding of Mark's intentions is to observe that the three dangers are those which are stressed in the rest of the gospel and that one characteristic of Mark's work is the prominent place which exhortation holds in it. The dangers which the Christian faces, as Mark sees them, may be set out diagrammatically on the next page.



Seed by the way side taken by Satan (4:15)	Conflict with Satan temptation (1:13) accusation by Pharisees (3:22-30) rebuke of Peter (8:33) demons (1:34, 39; 3:15; 6:13; 7:26-30; 9:38-39)
Seed in rocky places tribulation, persecution, stumbling (θλιψις, διωγμος εκαυδαλιζεσθαι ) (4:16-17)	θλιψις (13:19, 24) διωγμος (10:30) εκαυδαλιζεσθαι (9:42-47; 14:27, 29) more generally, distresses in ch. 13, call to watch, take up cross, lose life (8:34, 35)
Seed among thorns cares of world deceitfulness of riches lusts of other things (4:18-19)	Two ages (10:30) riches (10:23-30, cf. 10:21) cf. adulterous and sinful generation 8:38, cf. 8:12) gain whole world (8:36)

There are three main themes, the conflict with Satan, the threat of persecution, and the enticements of the present age, especially the danger of riches. These exhortations are not general moral imperatives, but are associated with the arrival of the end-time and the imminent appearance of the Son of man<sup>(62)</sup>. Although the interpretation of the Sower does not directly explain the meaning of the mystery of the kingdom, it fits in with it in so far as the ethic which it presupposes is itself dependent upon the unfolding of the final drama. Far from being 'a distinct disappointment' and pronouncing truths which are no more than 'facts of daily experience from the beginning'<sup>(63)</sup>, the interpretation sets out a demand which is not universal moral teaching but which is the correlative of the coming of the kingdom.

One point in the interpretation of the parable remains unexplained, the meaning of 'the word'. Taylor takes it as 'the Christian message', although he suggests that it may be used in the sense of 'the teaching' or 'the good news'<sup>(64)</sup>. Nineham sees as typical of the later period in which this interpretation was composed that 'the word' is used absolutely to mean 'the gospel' as in Gal 6:6; Col 4:3 and 1 Pet 2:8<sup>(65)</sup>. Quesnell thinks that 'the word' in chapter 4 is the same word which Jesus has preached in 2:2 and which he speaks openly in 8:32, i.e. the word of the cross<sup>(66)</sup>. All this may be true as far as it goes, but in the light of Mark's overall eschatological scheme and the strong eschatological stress in 1:14-15 it seems more probable that the word is the 'mystery of



the kingdom of God'. The interpretation of the parable is not an exposition of the mystery; that should be known to the disciples by direct revelation. The parable is the exhortation which follows that knowledge and sets out the rigorist ethic which will be discussed in the next chapter.

This examination of Mark's eschatology has confirmed the view that there is an important distinction between his statement 'Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God' and the Matthaean and Lukan form 'Unto you is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven (God)'. Mark lays more emphasis upon the fact that the disciples are the elect and his wording corresponds closely to the teaching about election found elsewhere in his gospel. The singular 'mystery' is more 'Pauline' and more closely connected with that circle of ideas which envisages God's plan being worked out in history, and it emphasizes the unity of the group of themes connected with the kingdom. Thus there is a double sense in which the disciples possess the mystery of the kingdom: they themselves will 'enter' it, sharing the blessings of the final consummation, and they will know and understand the divine plan of the end-time which is being worked out from the first moment of the coming of John the Baptist.

Thus the interpretation of the parable of the Sower is related to the mystery of the kingdom, but 4:13, 'Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know all the parables?' still remains to be considered. It seems to imply that the interpretation of the parable of the Sower is in some way the key to understanding the meaning of the other parables in the gospel, or at least of those in the rest of the chapter<sup>(67)</sup>. Matthew and Luke seem to have found the verse difficult or otiose, since they both substitute for it a simple introduction to the interpretation of the parable. In what way, then, is the interpretation a means towards understanding 'all the parables'? A possible answer is that merely by showing this parable to be an allegory similar interpretations have to be made of the other parables. But while this is relatively simple in the case of the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, and Mark almost certainly saw it as an allegory, it is by no means clear how the parable of the Seed Growing Secretly and of the Mustard Seed are to be allegorized, or how this would be done with the other sayings



which Mark designates as παραβολαι (3:23-29; 7:14-23; 13:28-29). If the parables to which Mark intends to refer are restricted to those in this chapter (and in view of Mark's use of the word 'parable' this is questionable), it might be that the identification of the seed as 'the word' is to be applied to the other two parables. The parable of the Seed Growing Secretly might then be said to contain teaching about predestination and the coming of the parousia - the earth bears fruit αὐτοματη, it is all in God's plan, with the harvest a common symbol for the end (cf. Joel 3:13), and the parable of the Mustard Seed points to the Gentile mission which is part of Mark's eschatological scheme according to 13:10. This seems rather forced, although as the Qumran biblical exegesis has shown, we must be on our guard to avoid supposing that our ways of thought are the same as those of first century writers. It may be, however, that it is to go beyond Mark's intentions to try to find a key to 'all the parables' here, and that the verse simply means: Do you not understand this parable in spite of the fact that you are the elect who have been granted the mystery of the kingdom? If you do not understand a straightforward parable how will you understand other enigmatic sayings? This would be in line with the surprise expressed at the failures of understanding found elsewhere (7:18; 8:17-21, cf. 4:40; 6:50-52) and also with the Markan use of παραβολη.

In the analysis above of the parable section in chapter 4 it has been found necessary to go outside the chapter itself to a section such as 8:27 - 9:1 in search of the meaning for Mark of 'the kingdom of God' and associated ideas, and so to determine his eschatological stance in general. Rather than to arrive at an overall picture of the teaching addressed to the disciples by considering each of the sayings addressed to them in turn, as was done in the previous chapter with the sayings addressed to opponents, it is proposed here to prosecute further the question of the eschatological teaching in Mark as a possible background to the ethical teaching in his gospel. For this it is necessary to begin with chapter 13.

Although there is a discouragingly large mass of literature on this chapter many of these studies can be disregarded since they are concerned with the problem of historical authenticity rather than with Mark's own understanding of what he has recorded<sup>(68)</sup>.



The question of the relation of the chapter to the rest of Mark, although a question with which redaction criticism has been concerned, may therefore be left on one side here. Whether it was added by Mark to his gospel when it had been almost completed<sup>(69)</sup>, or formed the conclusion of the first stage of the gospel's formation<sup>(70)</sup> is of less importance than the recognition that in its present form the gospel contains this chapter immediately before the passion narrative. For even if there were tensions between different sections of the work, which may be a starting point for an analysis of its history, it still has to be explained why these appeared insignificant to the final redactor. It has to be assumed at some stage in the study of the gospel that the completed work 'made sense' to Mark.

This last observation is relevant not only to the position of chapter 13 in the gospel but also to the interpretation of chapter 13 itself. Thus the vast majority of studies on the chapter concentrated upon an analysis of it into its sources and of the Markan redaction, with emphasis upon the evident breaks in the construction and inconsistencies in the teaching between the different sections<sup>(71)</sup>. But apart from the general fact that apocalyptic prophecies frequently exhibit inner inconsistencies, two facts suggest that this approach has failed to lead to an adequate understanding of the chapter: there is so little agreement between the attempts to recover the sources that the method employed is manifestly unsatisfactory on its own<sup>(72)</sup>, and there has been an unwillingness to look squarely at the essential unity of the chapter. If Mark constructed the discourse from a Jewish-Christian apocalypse or from independent sayings ascribed to Jesus in the tradition, he has carried out his work in a far more thorough-going manner than anywhere else in his gospel. Jesus speaks uninterruptedly in vv. 5-37 and there are no references to his making a fresh start. This is in stark contrast to the insertion elsewhere of such phrases as *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* (cf. 2:27; 4:2, 21, 24; 6:10; 7:9; 8:21; 9:1), or even to the inclusion of introductory words taken from the tradition such as has happened according to Jeremias in 4:9, 26, 30<sup>(73)</sup>. The audience remains the same for a longer period than anywhere else (contrast the changes in 4:10; 7:14, 17; 8:34). Further, the sections of the discourse are not easily separated by the methods of form criticism.<sup>(74)</sup> Only at the beginning of the chapter are there resemblances to Mark's practice



elsewhere in that he provides a setting to the saying in v.2 and introduces the main part of the chapter as secret instruction given to the four disciples (vv.3-5a), and at the end where isolated sayings are more loosely grouped (vv.28-37, cf. 4:21-25; 8:34-9:1; 9:40-50). In vv.5-27 the unity is so strong as to overshadow the alleged inconsistencies. Thus Kümmel has pointed to the temporal references as indicators that Mark intends to describe a sequence of eschatological events - 'but the end is not yet' (v.7), 'these things are the beginning of travail' (v.8), 'the gospel must first be preached' (v.10), 'then (τότε) let them that are in Judaea flee' (v.14), 'then (τότε) if any man shall say' (v.21), 'after that tribulation' (v.24), 'then (τότε) shall they see the Son of man' (v.26), 'then (τότε) shall he send forth the angels' (v.27)<sup>(75)</sup>. The unity of the chapter for Mark is further seen in his use of connecting links: πάντα, twice in v.4<sup>(76)</sup> is picked up in vv.8, 29 and 30, and the time of the coming of 'these things' is stressed even though the precise content of the word seems to vary in the different contexts<sup>(77)</sup>. Moreover, the repetition of βλεπετε in vv.5, 9, 23, 33, looking back to v.2<sup>(78)</sup> is a pointer not only to the unity of the chapter but a characteristic of that unity which has been frequently misinterpreted. The large amount of exhortation and warning here has been taken as the basis of interpretation, as for example by Schmid who describes it as 'eschatologisch motivierte Paränese'<sup>(79)</sup>, or by Beasley Murray when he remarks that he knows of no other apocalypse in which there is so high a proportion of admonitions and in which instruction and exhortation are so completely interwoven<sup>(79a)</sup>. These observations may well be correct, but they do not necessarily lead to the conclusion that what we have here is not an apocalypse or concerned with prophesying the events of the End. In vv.5-37 there are nineteen imperatives (twenty if καὶ προσευχεσθε is accepted in v.33<sup>(80)</sup>). Of these only ἀγρυπνεῖτε (v.33) and γρηγορεῖτε (vv.35 and 37) have an ethical sense, and the exact meaning to be attached to the latter is uncertain<sup>(81)</sup>. For the rest the imperatives draw attention to the events which are to come and to a possible misunderstanding of these events. Thus βλεπετε in vv. 5 and 23 warns against the false teachers (hence the call not to believe them in v.21), and this is reinforced by the statement, 'I have told you all things beforehand'. The reason why the disciples should not be afraid of the coming wars



(*μη θροεσθε* v.7) is that they are part of God's predestined plan (*δε*) and within that plan these events precede the End, which is 'not yet'. Five exhortations in vv.14-18 call for flight to the mountains and urge prayer that the worst sufferings of winter may be avoided, while the curious *ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω* (v.14) is most satisfactorily explained as an aside by Mark akin to that in 7:19 calling attention to the hidden meaning of *το βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐργασίας*<sup>(82)</sup>. In vv. 28-9 the imperatives draw attention to the enigmatic meaning of the fig tree as pointing to the way in which the signs will indicate the imminent approach of the End (or the parousia of the Son of man). Finally, while it might be argued that the imperatives in vv.9 and 11 have a moral stress in urging endurance under persecution and in promising the gift of the Holy Spirit, the whole setting has a strongly predestinarian cast as may be seen in the straight description in future tenses, in the presence of *δε* once again, in the fact that the disciples are passive mouthpieces of the Spirit, and in the strongly eschatological sense of *σωθῆσεται*, even if *ἐς τέλος* is to be distinguished in meaning from *το τέλος* in v.7<sup>(83)</sup>. They are, therefore, hardly to be regarded as ethical admonitions in the normal sense. Whatever pastoral concern is to be found in the chapter, the basis for the warnings is the certainty that a course of history has been predestined and only waits its unfolding, and it is these imperatives that tie the discourse into an eschatological unity<sup>(84)</sup>.

Whatever the original meaning of the saying in v.2<sup>(85)</sup>, Mark, by providing the present narrative setting and joining it to the discourse in vv.5-37, has linked the destruction of the temple with the events of the End. This is made even clearer by the double mention of *ταῦτα* in v.4, the first of which refers to the events of v.2, while the second, despite objections raised by some on the grounds of the grammar<sup>(86)</sup>, must refer to the End since *συτελεσθαι* has an almost technical sense<sup>(87)</sup>. Whether they are to be distinguished in this way, or whether they apply initially to the destruction of the temple, Cranfield's judgement is correct that the form of the question in v.4 implies that the destruction is 'part of the complex of events leading up to the End'<sup>(88)</sup>, although this proves nothing about the historicity of the question.



The reply of Jesus begins with a warning against those who will come in his name and lead many astray (vv.5-6). The precise sense of both ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου and λεγοντες ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι has been disputed<sup>(89)</sup>. For our purpose the nature of these deceivers is less important than the fact that Mark envisaged the coming of such false teachers or false messiahs either as the first stage of the final events or, more probably, as a danger throughout the period. (Note the absence of any time sequence at the beginning of v.7 and the further mention of false Christs and false prophets in v.22<sup>(90)</sup>.)

The disciples had asked when these things would happen and in the discourse this is picked up five times (vv. 7, 11, 14, 28, 29), a further indication of the essential unity of the completed chapter. The prophecy of the future properly begins at v.7 with the prediction of 'wars and rumours of wars',<sup>(91)</sup>. It is expressly stated that this is not the End, but v.8, which is closely linked to this verse by γὰρ<sup>(92)</sup> and thus refers to the same group of events, describes them as the ἀρχὴ ὀδύνης, the birth pangs of the new age, corresponding to the messianic woes of much apocalyptic writing. Thus although the end is 'not yet', these verses do not have in mind a postponement of the eschatological expectation<sup>(93)</sup>. The end events are now set in motion and they move on remorselessly to the End. The point is not postponement but a recognition of a sequence of events which must take place before the Son of man finally comes. The wars and natural disasters are not to be sharply differentiated from the transcendent events later described in the discourse, since all belong to the common apocalyptic expectations<sup>(94)</sup>.

A change of theme is frequently found at v.9 and there is a greater readiness to regard the material here as authentic sayings of Jesus. If, however, the understanding of the passage is not distorted either by premature questions of authenticity or by a reading of Mark in the light of Matthew and Luke, it will be seen that, with the possible exception of v.10, the section follows naturally and easily upon the earlier prophecies. Having foretold war, earthquake and faming, Mark proceeds to describe sufferings more directly affecting the Christians, i.e. persecution and family divisions. The fact that the latter is a common theme in apocalyptic makes it probable that Mark, whatever his sources here, understood the persecution in the same way<sup>(95)</sup>.



V.10 stands out so strikingly from the surrounding passage that almost all the commentators take it as a Markan insertion<sup>(96)</sup>. This is probably correct, but whether he added it or not it is necessary to see why he placed it, or retained it, at this point. The verse should not be regarded as teaching a delay in the parousia, an interval which is 'the time of God's patience',<sup>(97)</sup>. The disasters show that the birthpangs have begun. Marxsen is to be preferred in seeing it as an interpretation of v.9, or as teaching that to witness before a tribunal is to preach the gospel and so to help to hasten the coming of the parousia by fulfilling the preconditions for its appearing<sup>(98)</sup>. This in itself is too heavily dependent upon his view that vv. 5-13 describe events of Mark's own time and fails to provide evidence for a close enough link between preaching the gospel and εἰς μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῖς. Yet Marxsen is correct in referring to Rom 11:25, for, as the καὶ shows, Mk 13:10 gives expression to one component in the eschatological scheme. The sequence of thought is that the persecutions arise as a consequence of the Gentile mission<sup>(98a)</sup>. Before the End (πρωτον) the Gentile mission will take place according to God's predetermined plan and this will result in the persecutions and family dissensions which form part of the sorrows which inaugurate the new age. The promises given to the disciples in the midst of these trials are also linked with eschatological ideas. Mark is reticent about the Holy Spirit, yet in three of the four passages in which it is mentioned there are eschatological overtones (1:8, 10; 3:29, and here; even 12:36 refers to the triumph of the messiah, although the Spirit is introduced to confirm the inspiration of David)<sup>(99)</sup>. Finally the enduring unto the end, even if εἰς τέλος is not a direct reference to the end of the world, has links with the waiting of Daniel 12:12-13 and the endurance of 4 Ezra 6:25, σωθῆσθαι referring to the full, eschatological salvation<sup>(100)</sup>. Once the Matthaean context is put aside, it becomes clear that to Mark this was a further stage of the birthpangs which had begun in vv.7-8, and the passage has its place within the overall structure of the chapter<sup>(101)</sup>.

To try to do justice to the abomination of desolation in a paragraph is the height of temerity, yet the attempt has to be made if the chapter is to be seen in perspective and the overall eschatology of Mark is to be understood. A new stage is introduced by



ὅταν δε , but in view of the shortening of the days (of distress) in v.20 and the final act of the drama in vv.24-27 it seems that this is still part of the birthpangs. Almost certainly the phrase το βδελυγμα της ἐργμωσεως is derived from Dan 9:27; 12:11, and the masculine ἐσθκτα indicates that some form of anti-christ is intended<sup>(102)</sup>. The address to the reader is a Markan addition and points to a hidden cypher, the meaning of which is now lost beyond recall<sup>(103)</sup>. We cannot say whether the reference is to the desecration or the destruction of the temple<sup>(104)</sup>. It is doubtful whether the reference is simply to the Jewish war, and still more questionable whether the call is for Christians to gather in Galilee to await the parousia, although in the light of the modes of thinking found in many modern messianic and millenarian movements<sup>(105)</sup> it cannot be absolutely ruled out, for we are entering a region where there is a strong logic but not the logic of normal thought. Inevitably metaphors and pictures derived from known experiences of warfare are used to describe this final conflict, but this does not necessarily mean that a historical battle is envisaged<sup>(106)</sup>. Similarly the conditions are those of Palestine, but this does not limit the reference to that geographical area nor show that the section is completely disparate from the earlier parts of the discourse. Even if Mark expects the battle to take place in Judaea, and this seems probable since he has linked the discourse with the prediction of the destruction of the temple and the Daniel quotation referred to the temple (though Mark's version ἐσθκτα ὅπου οὐ δε is veiled and enigmatic), the mingling of terrestrial and transcendent features is common in apocalyptic, and warfare in a narrowly circumscribed region could well be part of events leading to the destruction of the present world order. The temple had great significance for Mark (cf. 11:11, 15-18; 15:38<sup>(107)</sup>). The general apocalyptic cast of the passage is shown in v.20 with the concept of a predetermined period which God by his divine fiat shortens and with the mention of the elect<sup>(108)</sup>. The language with its redundancies and exaggerations emphasizes the harshness of the distress and such phrases as 'and never shall be' cannot be taken as proof that Mark envisages history as continuing beyond these disasters<sup>(109)</sup>.

The allusion to false Christs and false prophets in vv.21-22 is often produced as evidence that this passage is from a different source from vv.5-6<sup>(110)</sup>. This may be so, but Mark has welded the two into a consistent whole. False leaders and prophets arise



throughout the period before the End and Mark reiterates his warnings against them. To meet their false teaching and the signs and wonders which they are able to display he proclaims the accuracy of Jesus' prediction: 'Behold, I have told you all things beforehand'. This is the basis of the exhortation. The apocalyptic note may be transformed, but it is not muted<sup>(111)</sup>.

Then comes the final scene. With a solemn 'in those days, after that tribulation',<sup>(112)</sup> Mark introduces the portents in the heavens which belong to it, cosmic events that are frequently mentioned in the Old Testament and apocalyptic literature<sup>(113)</sup> and which Mark probably understood literally<sup>(114)</sup>. Finally, *καὶ τότε*, the Son of man comes. Whether or not in this, or in some other, form the saying is authentic, and even if in Daniel the Son of man goes to the ancient of days (Dan 7:13), in the present setting the picture can only be that of Jesus as the Son of man coming from heaven to gather the elect to heaven<sup>(115)</sup>. The angels as messianic agents and the gathering of the elect can be paralleled in Jewish writings<sup>(116)</sup>. Commentators note the absence of several features traditional in Jewish apocalyptic, such as the judgement and punishment of evil and the description of the bliss of the elect, and express surprise that there is no further mention of the fate of the abomination of desolation<sup>(117)</sup>, but Mark was not simply drawing from Jewish apocalyptic, and may even have derived most of this chapter from Christian tradition. His account reaches a satisfactory conclusion with the glory of the Son of man and the gathering of the elect to heaven.

Thus, whether Mark constructed the discourse in vv.5-27 from isolated sayings or longer sources, or whether he took over a relatively complete apocalypse and added only small comments, the result is quite different from any other of Jesus' speeches in this gospel. Even if some of the connecting links may be catchwords, the section as a whole has a unity and a development which is lacking elsewhere. Here is a sequence of events with a tight framework of temporal adverbs and conjunctions and linked together with backward and forward references. This suggests that the events of the eschaton were important to Mark, and that he was not merely concerned with exhortations and warnings within their framework. Pesch, Trocmé and Marxsen would seem to be correct, therefore, in the emphasis which they place upon this chapter, and those who try to devalue its



importance by stressing that few of the sayings are authentic have failed to understand Mark's thought.

On the other hand, the conclusion of the discourse in 13:28-37 is more akin to some of the other collections of sayings in Mark in that there is a looser structure and less concern with consistency. Even here, however, the interjected references to Jesus' speaking to his audience are absent and the themes are less diverse even than those in 8:34 - 9:1 or 9:40-50. Again we shall confine ourselves to the question of what ideas were important to Mark in the conclusion which he has chosen to give to the discourse. For it is this section that is most often appealed to when it is desired to show that the discourse is paraenetic rather than apocalyptic in character. There is, indeed, repeated stress on watching ( $\beta\gamma\rho\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  (v.33),  $\gamma\omega\gamma\rho\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  (vv.35-37), but, as we have seen, the exhortations are lacking in content and it is illegitimate to fill them out from Matthew or Paul. While there is a certain stress upon the suddenness of the parousia and on ignorance of the exact time (vv.32, 33, 35, 36), there is no suggestion that the End lies in an indefinite future, and efforts to defend Jesus against the charge of ignorance about the later course of history by stressing that his eschatology was radically different from Jewish apocalyptic fail to pay sufficient heed to vv.29-30 where the obvious sense is not to be explained away<sup>(118)</sup>.

Assuming that in these few verses Mark did not intend to set several completely divergent views of the future side by side, it is necessary to seek some overall pattern of thought in the passage. He begins with the 'parable' to be learnt from the fig tree (vv.28-9). The emphasis is upon the parallel between the budding of the tree pointing to the approach of summer and the appearance of 'these things' showing that  $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\upsilon\varsigma \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu \epsilon\pi\iota \theta\upsilon\rho\alpha\iota\varsigma$ . The two occurrences of  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$  in v.4 have already been noticed, and in v.8  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$  probably refers to all the events mentioned in the verse and indirectly to the wars in v.7, since vv.7-8 are closely linked in thought. Here in v.29 the precise content of 'these things' is partly determined by the subject which is supplied to  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ . The reference is probably to the final act of the drama and thus either to the Son of man himself<sup>(119)</sup> or to the events of vv.26-27<sup>(120)</sup>.  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$  would then denote either the cosmic events of vv.24-25 or if, as we have argued, Mark regards the whole chapter as a description of a single sequence of events, everything



from v.5 to v.25. 'These things' are the sign which the disciples sought. Indeed, the 'sign' is the initial stage of the eschaton. Mark regards the events foretold in the chapter, therefore, as occurring in a relatively short space of time, for once they have begun *ἔργα ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θούρας* (121).

All attempts at an interpretation of v.30 which depart from the plain sense that the whole drama will take place within the lifetime of those present during the earthly ministry of Jesus can only be described as evasions<sup>(122)</sup>. This verse, however, is making a different point from the previous one. There the close connection between the anticipatory birth-pangs and the final consummation is stressed, but no mention is made of the date when the whole sequence is to begin. Here that is expressly stated, *ταῦτα πάντα* referring to everything already referred to in the discourse.

Verse 32 has been seen as contradicting the imminent hope of v.30<sup>(123)</sup>. The saying may be authentic<sup>(124)</sup> or it may have been framed to explain the delay of the parousia<sup>(125)</sup>, but it seems inconceivable that Mark used it in its present context in order to say with one breath that the parousia would come within the lifetime of the contemporaries of Jesus and with the next that it might be delayed almost indefinitely in the forbearance of God; or that previously having laid such emphasis upon the exact prediction of what was to happen (cf. v.23 and the repeated *καὶ*, coupled with the acceptance of 'these things' as a sign of the End in v.29 and the stress upon the certainty of the words of Jesus in v.31), he should then in this verse reject all attempts to discover and interpret the signs of their coming. A plausible explanation might be that Mark has recorded this saying in a form in which the conventional eschatological phrase *ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη* has been modified by the addition *ἡ τῆς ὥρας* so as to emphasize the precise moment of the parousia. What he intends might be something like this: the events of the end-time are predetermined by God and will occur in the way they have been described, so that by discerning the early stages of the sequence it will be possible for those who have been granted divine insight or secret instruction to recognize that the Son of man will come very soon; this total event will happen during this generation, but the precise moment of its occurrence is known only to God<sup>(126)</sup>.



It is this combination of an imminent hope with uncertainty about the exact time which gives force to the urgent call to 'watch in vv. 33-37. V.31 fits precisely into such an interpretation, whereas it is difficult to see how Mark could have combined so heavy an emphasis upon the exact prediction of the events with a view that the date of the parousia was completely unknown and might extend into the distant future<sup>(127)</sup>

The admonitions to watchfulness are as loosely assembled as the sayings at the end of several other discourses. The presence of catchwords may explain Mark's failure to observe a certain tension between vv. 34 and 35, where the former saying implies a lengthy absence of the householder and the corresponding work and responsibilities entrusted to the servants, while the latter suits the present context more satisfactorily and speaks of the return of the master of the house from some business or festive occasion and the need for the porter to stay up until his return. The emphasis is clearly placed upon the second picture ('suddenly', 'find you sleeping', the detailed four watches of the night, and further back, 'ye know not when the time is') and the difference between this and the first picture is reduced when v.34 is treated on its own and not interpreted on the basis of the parable of the Talents (Mt 25:14), for the stress is placed upon the porter who is commanded to watch. The only indicative verb in the sentence is ἐνετελεσται, the stage setting being described with participles and τῷ θυρωρῷ being emphasized with καί. To infer from the absence of the householder 'in another country' that Mark envisaged a long period during which Jesus was absent from his church is to misunderstand his intention here<sup>(128)</sup>, for the sense of urgency is acute in the whole passage and this is an urgency which is hardly prompted by the thought that Jesus might come at any moment in an indeterminate future<sup>(129)</sup>.

No specific content is given to the command to watch<sup>(130)</sup>. The verb ἀγρυπνεῖν (ἀγρυπνεῖτε in v.33) has been derived from ἀγρᾶ (chase) and ὕπνος (sleep) and 'chasing sleep' may be near to chasing sleep away<sup>(131)</sup>, but usage is of more importance than etymology and in biblical usage it is used metaphorically of being watchful, on the whole without any strong or definite content<sup>(132)</sup>. γρηγορεῖν (γρηγορεῖτε v.35) is found more frequently in the New Testament than ἀγρυπνεῖν and occurs in 14:34, 37, 38 outside the apocalyptic chapter.<sup>(133)</sup>



An examination of its occurrences shows that almost everywhere the underlying sense of being awake is present<sup>(134)</sup>. Few references make clear what watching involves in term of practical action, although this can be inferred from the larger contexts in a number of places. In the parables and metaphors watching means essentially remaining awake and being prepared for what may occur and thus being able to take appropriate action, by opening the door to the master or preventing the house from being burgled. Elsewhere the imperative is little more than an emotional call to action which has to be filled in from the general Christian instruction. Thus Mark is in line with other New Testament writers in his intensely emotional use of this term which is almost totally lacking in specific content. To discover what he envisages this watching to imply we have to go beyond the word itself to his total eschatology and ethical thought.

In chapter 13, then, Mark has linked the prophecy of the destruction of the temple with the prediction of an ordered and predetermined sequence of events, some 'historical', others 'transcendental'. These are not sharply differentiated from each other, and together they constitute the final epoch and lead up to the End, the coming of Jesus, the Son of man, and the gathering of the elect. The period between the first and last of these events is short and the time of their coming is imminent although not precisely defined, since God alone knows when the End will be. Christians must prepare themselves for the coming of the Son of man; they must 'watch' and not 'sleep'.

Such is the eschatological drama as Jesus teaches it to the four disciples. But Mark has recorded other teaching by Jesus concerning the mystery of the kingdom of God earlier in his gospel, and immediately after this chapter he begins the narrative of the Passion which, with the story of the empty tomb, occupies the rest of his book. It is necessary, therefore, to relate the prediction of the last things to this other material.

It may reasonably be maintained that the rigid separation so often made between the Son of man sayings which refer to the passion and those which refer to the parousia as well as that between sayings referring to the Son of man and those referring to the kingdom of God have distorted the picture which Mark intended to present. In 8:27 - 9:1 these themes are linked together in a short,



tightly packed section of the gospel, where Jesus is identified as the Son of man, the sufferings, crucifixion and resurrection are foretold, Peter is rebuked, there is a call to strenuous discipleship linked with a threat or promise of recognition of this action when the Son of man comes in the glory of his Father, and the section is rounded off with the statement that some of those standing by will still be alive when the kingdom comes with power.

By the coming of the Son of man in this complex must be meant that final coming on the clouds with great power and glory described in 13:26-27<sup>(135)</sup>. Further, since the reference to the coming of the kingdom of God ἐν δυνάμει follows immediately this is to be closely connected with, even if it is not to be exactly equated with, that event. The Son of man comes in the glory of his Father, and this presumably manifests to men the kingdom of his Father in its full power. The closeness of the link is confirmed by the temporal references to 'some of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death' until they see the kingdom in 9:1 and to 'this generation' which 'shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished' in 13:30.

Because Mark is writing in the period between the resurrection and the parousia, he cannot have identified these two events. For him a period, shorter or longer according to the dating of his gospel, must have intervened<sup>(136)</sup>. This is presumably the period in which the disciple takes up his cross and loses his life for the sake of the gospel, for none of the disciples were caught up in the crucifixion of Jesus. The time for strenuous discipleship is, then, the time of the interval between the resurrection and the parousia. Since resurrection is itself an eschatological concept, it is necessary to determine Mark's understand of it if his own eschatological viewpoint is to be discerned, and this, as is well known, involves some acute problems, for, despite his reiterated references to the resurrection (8:31; 9:9-10, 31; 10:34; 14:28), Mark is curiously reticent about it. If he ended his work at 16:8<sup>(137)</sup>, there is no record of resurrection appearances and the gospel concludes in silence and fear. The statement that the women disobeyed the 'young man' at the tomb and 'said nothing to anyone' does not absolutely preclude any continuation of the narrative, since the pericope could have been followed by an appearance to the



disciples unconnected with the episode of the women and independent of their having passed on the message<sup>(138)</sup>, but it is not without significance that both Matthew and Luke had difficulty in continuing from Mark's abrupt ending, and it is a priori improbable that a continuation should have vanished without trace if Mark had written one<sup>(139)</sup>. Thus we are left with an empty tomb, an announcement of the fact that the resurrection has taken place and an unfulfilled commission. It is in line with this that the 'Christian' affirmation 'Truly this man was a Son of God' (15:39) is placed at the moment of Jesus' death and not after his resurrection. The contrast with the place of Thomas' confession in Jn 20:28 is striking.

On the other hand some emphasis is placed upon three features connected with the resurrection. Firstly, it is 'after three days',<sup>(140)</sup> secondly, Jesus predicts that after he is raised he will 'go before' ( $\pi\rho\epsilon\chi\omega$ ) the disciples into Galilee (14:28), a saying which is recapitulated by the 'young man' at the tomb, with the addition of the words, 'there shall ye see him, as he said unto you' (16:7), and thirdly, the disciples are told to say nothing about the transfiguration 'save when the Son of man should have risen again from the dead' (9:9), which leads to perplexity among the disciples as to what the rising from the dead might be.

Apart from these three references in Mark, the phrase 'after three days' occurs in the New Testament only in Mt 27:63 in the account peculiar to Matthew of the setting of a guard on the tomb, and there it is immediately followed by 'until the third day'. Elsewhere the term used is always  $\tau\eta \tau\rho\iota\tau\eta \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$ <sup>(141)</sup>. Following Field<sup>(142)</sup> it is commonly claimed that the two phrases had an identical meaning<sup>(143)</sup>, but the fact that Matthew and Luke substituted a more historically accurate phrase (or perhaps to be more exact, a phrase which had become fixed in the kerygma) suggests that they detected a difference. Discussion has frequently been obscured by a primary aim of deciding the authenticity of the saying<sup>(144)</sup>. Nineham finds the origin of the double tradition in the influence of Hos 6:2 and Jonah 1:17, but while Hos 6:2 together with the uniform tradition that Jesus was crucified on the Friday and rose early on the Sunday morning may explain 'on the third day', the Jonah reference in Mt 12:40, which is given a different interpretation in the Lukan form (Lk 11:30), seems very uncertain



evidence for the source of the predominantly Markan phrase<sup>(145)</sup>. There is, moreover, no hint in the Markan tradition that the resurrection after three days is in fulfilment of scripture, in contrast to Paul's explicit statement in 1 Cor 15:4. Even if we accept that the phrase was the one spoken by Jesus himself, we should have to assume that Mark retained it out of respect for the dominical word and interpreted it as meaning 'on the third day', a respect which does not seem to accord with his willingness to alter the prediction of the passion in 10:33-34. No satisfactory explanation of the phrase has so far been offered<sup>(146)</sup>. In its general setting in Mark's gospel it links the resurrection closely with the crucifixion and separates it from the parousia, although in 8:27 - 9:1 there is a parallel between the sufferings and resurrection of Jesus and the sufferings of the disciples and their acceptance by the Son of man at the parousia.

Four interpretations of 14:28/16:7 have been offered<sup>(147)</sup>. The most generally accepted view is that both statements mean that after the resurrection Jesus will precede the disciples to Galilee where they will see him in resurrection appearances<sup>(148)(149)</sup>. Johannes Weiss thought that the prophecy was that Jesus would collect his scattered disciples and lead them into Galilee and that the kingdom of God would arrive as soon as they reached there<sup>(150)</sup>. Lohmeyer interpreted the sayings on the basis of his thesis that Galilee was a theological concept in Mark determining the ministry of Jesus and the eschatological conclusion of the gospel. Galilee is the land of the eschatological consummation. The present *προαγε* meant that Jesus was even at that moment on his way to Galilee in fulfilment of the prophecy in 14:28 and the disciples should follow him there. 'There shall ye see him', added in 16:7 to the original prophecy points to the parousia and not to the resurrection appearances<sup>(151)</sup>. C.F. Evans argues that when *προαγειν* has an object in classical Greek, in the LXX, and in the New Testament (with the exception of Mt 14:22; 21:31, and perhaps 2:9 and 21:9) the verb means 'to lead', 'to go at the head of'. He accepts this sense in 14:28 and argues that this meaning excludes the interpretation of 14:28 and 16:7 as referring either to resurrection appearances in Galilee or to a Galilean parousia. The promise of 14:28 is a prophecy of the world mission of the church<sup>(152)</sup>.



Since we are attempting to discover Mark's understanding of the sayings which he included in his gospel we shall not discuss the authenticity of 14:28<sup>(153)</sup>. Even the question whether Mark received this section of the passion narrative in its present form or himself inserted 14:28 at this point is of less importance than the fact that this is how he passed on the tradition. He plainly attached considerable importance to the prophecy, since he includes the specific reference to it in 16:7<sup>(154)</sup>. The two verses must plainly be taken together and an interpretation be found which suits both. Since *προαγειν* c.acc. can be shown to mean both 'precede' and 'lead' in the New Testament, little weight can be placed upon the argument from the grammatical construction. Against the view that the words mean 'lead into Galilee' is the lack of any tradition of such a journey, and the traditions of Galilean appearances cannot be dismissed lightly<sup>(155)</sup>. Such an appearance in Matthew and the use he has made of Mk 16:7 in connexion with it does not establish the sense which Mark attached to the saying and it is necessary to guard against interpreting Mark from the standpoint of the later gospels. Nevertheless, it is extremely difficult to see how the disciples should fail to see Jesus before they reach Galilee if he is leading them there<sup>(156)</sup>, and while Evans' interpretation of 14:27-28 as a dominical saying is possible in itself, to accept this as Mark's understanding of the saying founders on the difficulty of applying this meaning to 16:7. No problems are raised by the phrase 'after I am raised' so long as this is interpreted as the specific act of resurrection corresponding to 'he is risen' in 16:6; resurrection appearances equally with the parousia must take place after Jesus has left the tomb, and it is that which is central to Mark's account of the resurrection.

Mark's meaning, therefore, can only be discovered in the light of his total eschatology. In themselves 14:28 and 16:7 give no clear indication as to the way the disciples will see Jesus in Galilee. Initially the most obvious view is that Mark refers to a resurrection appearance, which need not necessarily have been in the form of those found in the other gospels or in Paul. This is suggested by the emphasis laid upon the resurrection and the statement of the young man in which 'he is risen, he is not here' is combined with 'there shall ye see him'. This seems to exclude a



vision in Jerusalem such as Matthew adds (Mt 28:8-10) and implies that Jesus is already in Galilee or at least is on his way there, if he is thought of as travelling in the same way as any other being on earth. This interpretation, however, makes it difficult to explain why Mark not only fails to recount any appearances but also makes the women fail to pass on the message to the disciples, and it almost imperatively demands that the ending of the gospel has been lost or was for some reason never written. To suggest possible ways in which Mark might have completed this work is to resort to fiction. What would be required would be some act which brought the disciples to Galilee - either a 'flight' from Jerusalem<sup>(157)</sup>, or the appearance of the angel to one or more of the disciples giving the message which the women had concealed out of fear, or even some event which led the women to break their silence. Apart from such speculation, the main difficulty of the theory that the conclusion of the gospel has been lost is to explain how it could have vanished so completely when the work was of sufficient importance for Matthew and Luke to use it extensively. If on the other hand it is accepted that Mark intentionally ended his gospel at 16:8 (and was not simply prevented from continuing his narrative by imprisonment or death), then we are faced with the curious phenomenon of an evangelist who either knew nothing of any resurrection appearances or who substituted the story of the empty tomb for such appearances. Curious as these may be, neither can be excluded, and until much stronger arguments are produced to show that Mark's account continued after 16:8 one of them must be accepted.

It is this lack of resurrection appearances which gives strength to the views of J. Weiss and Lohmeyer that 14:28 and 16:7 do not allude to such appearances but to something else. Granted that damaging criticisms of these theories can be presented, making them untenable in the form in which they have been presented, it is nevertheless difficult to avoid the feeling that, as explanations of Mark's thought, they are on the right lines. What is needed is to co-ordinate the sayings of Jesus concerning the kingdom, the suffering and resurrection of the Son of man, and the parousia into a satisfactory unity which will provide a reasonably consistent eschatology, but first the third of the sayings concerning the resurrection must be taken into consideration, 9:9-10. The disciples are commanded by



Jesus not to tell anyone about the things they had seen on the mount of transfiguration 'save when the Son of man should have risen again from the dead'. To this Mark (or his source) adds the comment that the disciples *τον λογον ἐκρατησαν προς ἑαυτους συνζητούντες τι ἐστιν το ἔκ νεκρων ἀναστῆναι*, which, according to whether *προς ἑαυτους* is taken with *ἐκρατησαν* or *συνζητούντες*, is interpreted either as 'they kept the matter (or saying) to themselves, questioning together what the reference to the rising from the dead might mean' or as 'they kept the saying in mind (i.e. obeyed the injunction to keep silence), questioning together among themselves ...' Commentators generally limit themselves to considering whether the incident is historical and the saying dominical, or whether it is part of the messianic secret and is an attempt to account for the fact that the transfiguration was unknown in the earliest tradition<sup>(158)</sup>. Our concern here is rather different. It may be noted that the injunction is part of the inner core of the secret given only to the three, and is thus akin to 13:5-37. Mark must, therefore, have held it to have special significance. Further it implies that there will be an opportunity to narrate the experience after the resurrection, and presumably that it was so narrated, since Mark is able to include the story of the Transfiguration in his gospel. Thus in the period between the resurrection and the parousia one of the features of the life of the community is the arrival at an understanding of some of the events of the earthly life of Jesus and the narration (and explanation) of those events. It is not specifically stated that the resurrection will produce this understanding, although this is perhaps implied by the fact that the three are also depicted as perplexed by what the resurrection itself should be and that the perplexity is to be relieved by the event itself. This is the only reference to the resurrection in Mark to be accorded a positive evaluation; the others, for all the emphasis placed upon the fact, contain no more than the bare statements that the Son of man would or must (δεῖ) rise again (8:31; 9:31; 10:34), while 'after I am raised up' (14:28) is parenthetical. Thus from another angle we are forced to conclude that for Mark the resurrection is a piece of the traditional kerygma which he has to reproduce, usually in set formulas, and only on one occasion does he perhaps find any significance in it. This accords with our earlier conclusion, that Mark deliberately does not record any resurrection appearances.



The different strands of eschatological teaching in Mark's gospel may now be drawn together, having in mind certain questions which have so far been left open. It has been argued that there is in this gospel a strong predestinarian belief that the events which are recorded are the fulfilment of a predetermined plan, and that both what has happened in the past and what will occur in the future are in a sense simply the unrolling of what has already been fixed in the purpose of God. Mark points this out less by a pattern of prophecy and fulfilment based on the Old Testament scriptures (although he does use this) than by his use of *dei* and of other ways of expressing divine necessity such as the fulfilment of predictions made by Jesus himself (8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34; 14:27, 30). The account of the events which lead up to the End in chapter 13 was seen to belong to this cast of thought, and it was suggested that Mark believed that once the process had begun it would run relentlessly to its conclusion in the coming of the Son of man and the gathering of the elect. Similarly the predictions of the passion are fulfilled in the passion narrative, and once this sequence is set in motion at the beginning of chapter 14 it continues without a break up to the announcement 'He is risen'. The third strand of eschatological thought is found in the sayings about the kingdom of God. We have seen that there is no evidence derived from the sayings themselves to suggest that Mark believed that the kingdom had arrived at any point in the events he was narrating. The saying spoken at the Last Supper (14:25) is as strongly futuristic as that in 9:1 and even more obviously futuristic than that in 1:15. Whereas, however, the sayings which predict the passion and the end event have a point of fulfilment clearly fixed in the crucifixion and the still awaited parousia, such a clear date of the coming of the kingdom is lacking. Indeed, the phrase 'the kingdom of God', when it is not used as an equivalent for eternal life (9:47; 10:23, 24, 25), appears to be an expression for the final decisive intervention of God (1:15; 9:1; 14:25). In what sense is it such an expression?

In the discussion above of the sayings about the resurrection we left open the views associated with J. Weiss and Lohmeyer/Marxsen that Mark intended by the 'seeing' of Jesus in Galilee the coming of the kingdom or the parousia, both of which are sufficiently imminent in his thought for this to be possible. It is necessary, however,



to decide between these two interpretations, and may not Grundmann be right when he says: 'Für den Evangelisten Markus ist die Nähe des Reiches Gottes die Nähe der Parusie'?(159) Both the coming of the kingdom of God with power and the events in 13:5-37 are spoken of in similar terms as to be expected within the first Christian generation (9:1; 13:30), and Mark can hardly have understood the saying in 9:1 in any other way than as referring to the future, final and complete arrival of the reign of God, a thought which is closely akin to that of the coming of the Son of man which is presented in 13:26 as the climax of the last things and is closely associated with this saying about the kingdom in 8:38<sup>(160)</sup>. In 14:25 the statement 'I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God' is separated only by the transition to the Mount of Olives from the statement 'After I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee'. If, then, it is asked when Mark envisaged that Jesus would drink the fruit of the vine new in the kingdom the answer must surely be that it is when the disciples see him in Galilee, and this would imply either that the kingdom came at the resurrection or that the coming of the kingdom is identified with the parousia. Granting Mark's low valuation of the resurrection and the improbability that he wished to record any resurrection appearances, the second of these propositions seems far more likely. Moreover, if the coming of the kingdom takes place at the parousia, there is less contrast between the two types of saying about the kingdom, for at the coming of the kingdom with the parousia the time of the reward for those who were not ashamed of Jesus and who endured loss and persecution begins (8:35, 38; 10:29-30).

What bearing would such a conclusion have on the interpretation of 1:15, the summary which Mark supplies of Jesus' preaching of the 'gospel of God', presumably to the crowds since no disciples have yet been called? Though Dodd's interpretation of this verse is to be rejected<sup>(161)</sup>, the position which it occupies in Mark's record and its initial statement *παραγγελλεται ὁ καιρος* suggest that the coming of the kingdom is rather more immediate than is indicated in chapter 13 when it supervenes upon the disasters listed there. If, however, the saying is read in the light of 8:27 - 9:1 it will be seen that the drama of the ministry of Jesus, his death, resurrection and the suffering of his followers is set between the first two pronouncements. The time has been fulfilled because the sequence of eschatological



events has been set in motion with the preaching of John the Baptist.<sup>115</sup> The kingdom itself only comes with the parousia, yet because the events are predetermined and must run their course now that they have begun, the kingdom has truly 'drawn near', and hence the sense of urgency.

If this is a correct interpretation of Mark's eschatology it raises questions about the way Mark understood the earthly ministry of Jesus and in particular what is the place of the conflict with evil in it. Of this two recent and opposing interpretations call for consideration.

J.M. Robinson sees the life of Jesus in Mark as a cosmic struggle between the Spirit and Satan, of which John the Baptist is the 'prophesied preparer'. This struggle continues in the life of the church. He draws his main evidence from the debate about exorcism (3:21-30) and the exorcisms narrated in Mark, to which the healing miracles and the stilling of the storm and the debates between Jesus and both his opponents and his disciples are akin, and he finds further support in the references to the persecutions which the disciples will have to face (10:30, 38-39; 13:9-13). The point at which Mark begins his gospel indicates that this eschatological action of God, prepared by John the Baptist, was inaugurated at the baptism and temptation and was carried on through the struggles with various forms of evil until in his death Jesus experienced 'the ultimate of historical involvement and of diabolic antagonism'. The force of evil was conclusively broken in the resurrection and the power of God's reign was established in history. The Markan eschatology, however, implies a continuation of this same kind of struggle between the Spirit and Satan until the final outcome and the goal of history is reached<sup>(162)</sup>.

E. Best confutes this interpretation in detail and offers a rival one. He also attaches great importance to the debate about exorcism, but claims that it shows that Jesus has already mastered and bound Satan and hence is now in a position to plunder his 'possessions' (τα σκευη), i.e. men in the power of Satan's underlings. Linking the passage with the narrative of the temptation (as Robinson had done) he argues that it was there that the victory was won, so that for Mark Satan was defeated and rendered powerless at the very beginning of Jesus' ministry. Hence there is no real 'conflict' with the demons but rather Jesus is seen as exercising his authority over



them and giving that authority to his disciples. Best is then faced with the problem of how to explain the meaning of the cross and of how to interpret the experience of the early Christians who found Satan very active, an activity reflected in the interpretation of the parable of the Sower (4:15). He solves the first problem by arguing that Mark did not regard all evil in the world as coming from Satan but saw it as also arising from 'the seductive power of wealth, from the fear of persecution, from the enticements of other men and women, and from a man's own inner weakness in that he is flesh and not spirit'. Jesus deals with this sin as an authoritative teacher who brings men to an understanding of the truth, especially of the meaning of the cross, which is both redemptive and also a way of life for them as well as him. 'The cross which is God's judgement, is borne by Jesus in order to redeem men and bring them into the new community.' The second problem is more intransigent and Best merely suggests three possible explanations: perhaps, like the author of Revelation, Mark regarded Satan as bound only temporarily, during the time of Jesus on earth, the time of the new Exodus, and as afterwards set free again to attack the community; perhaps Mark included the interpretation of the Sower without realizing that the explanation of the seed sown by the wayside was inconsistent with his own view; perhaps Mark in 4:15 uses Satan to mean the community of unclean spirits and not Satan himself<sup>(163)</sup>.

Best has shown that there is less struggle in the exorcism narratives than Robinson claims, and that the binding of the strong one and the plundering of his house are not necessarily identical. The ministry of Jesus is therefore not correctly characterized as 'carrying through the struggle against Satan in the powers of the Spirit'. Best is also correct in rejecting Robinson's view that Satan is present in Jesus' debates with his disciples and opponents, and in his view that for Mark wealth, persecution and other men are sources of temptation<sup>(164)</sup>. It is not clear, however, that 3:27 will bear the weight that Best wishes to put upon it, or that 1:13 is correctly interpreted of a conflict with and victory over Satan. 3:27 is part of a set of answers to the scribes which Mark says were ἐν παραβολαῖς, which is itself a warning that the words are enigmatic and to be interpreted with caution. One cannot say that 'the strong man is undoubtedly Satan'<sup>(165)</sup>. This is only one possibility.



Another possibility is that the 'parable' simply indicates that as you have to bind a strong man before you can plunder his goods, so the forces of evil (Satan and demons) must be conquered on each occasion of exorcism before those enslaved by them can be freed, an interpretation which is in line with vv.23-26 and their implication that Satan's kingdom is not yet at an end. The absence of struggle in the exorcisms can be explained as due to the vastly superior power and authority of Jesus which Mark depicts as that of the Son of man and Son of God. Further it is by no means certain that 1:13 represents a conflict with Satan in which he is decisively defeated. To make it do so Best has to draw a sharp distinction between the use of *πειρασμοῦ* here and later in the gospel where the temptation comes from men (8:11; 10:2; 12:15), and has also to treat the 'temptation' of the disciples in Gethsemane as 'the struggle of the human will against divine will', which Jesus himself also had to face<sup>(166)</sup>. Even if there is a distinction between being tempted by Satan in 1:13 and by men and one's own weak nature in the other passages, the victory over Satan's temptation would not necessarily mean that Jesus was 'victorious to such a degree that he was afterwards able to spoil Satan's house and kingdom. The symbolism in 1:13 is, as Best admits<sup>(167)</sup>, unclear in its significance and hardly such as to justify what is a singular interpretation of *πειρασμοῦ* as denoting the eschatological struggle with Satan, the outcome of which can then be deduced from 3:27 and the authority which Jesus possesses over the demons.

Both Robinson and Best are faced with the difficulty that the defeat of Satan at an early point in the eschatological drama leaves unanswered the question why Christians are still subject to his assaults. For Robinson the decisive victory was achieved through the ability of Jesus to maintain the struggle right up to the cross, and in the resurrection 'the force of evil is conclusively broken and the power of God's reign established in history'<sup>(168)</sup>. Yet the struggle between the Spirit and Satan continues in the history of the church until the final outcome is reached<sup>(169)</sup>. He does not explain this apparent inconsistency between the victory achieved in the resurrection and the continuing struggle up to the parousia, but he probably intends it to be interpreted along the lines of Cullmann's view that the resurrection was the Al Alamein of the eschatological



war with evil<sup>(170)</sup>, for he claims that Mark distinguishes the period of church history in which eschatological blessing and persecution are combined from the non-eschatological history preceding the coming of Jesus on the one hand and from the new Aeon in which all pain, suffering and evil are absent on the other, and states that the period of church history was inaugurated by the Christ event<sup>(171)</sup>. Best recognizes the difficulty but can offer no more than three tentative solutions, all of them unsatisfactory, for the theory that Mark regarded the binding of Satan as only temporary is sheer conjecture, his inconsistency in including 4:15, even if it is taken from a source, is of a serious measure if he intended weight to be placed upon the defeat of Satan in the temptation, and that Satan is used corporately of the unclean spirits founders on the fact that if 'Satan' can sometimes have this meaning it can also have it in 1:13.

Both these accounts of Mark's eschatology create more problems than they solve because they fail to give sufficient place to the teaching of Jesus about the kingdom of God and about the events leading up to the End in chapter 13. Robinson devotes a section of his book to the apocalypse and recognizes that the future coming of the kingdom of God in power is identified through the close association of 8:38 and 9:1 with the coming of the Son of man. He describes this as a 'future event in time and space' which brings history to its consummation, but wrongly characterizes it as 'but the completion of the eschatological history of Jesus', and holds that its main importance lies in giving a particular orientation to the intervening period of Jesus' ministry and the history of the church which it interprets in terms of struggle<sup>(172)</sup>. This leads to a further distortion of Mark's eschatology in the assertion that the stress found in Matthew and Luke on the historical nature of the coming eschatological events only continues a trend already present in Mark, for this underestimates the importance of the imminence of the End for Mark and exaggerates the extent to which he was writing for the ongoing Christian community<sup>(173)</sup>. For the other two evangelists, although the life of the church is lived in eschatological history, in which the struggle with Satan is a dominant feature, it is none the less history in which the End is receding into the distant future and is providing opportunity for working out of moral and sociological issues. This is, however, not in tune



with Mark's presentation of the teaching of Jesus, which is primarily concerned with the person and activity of the Son of man and the eschatological drama of the kingdom and the parousia.

Best recognizes that in the teaching of Jesus as Mark presents it the kingdom is future, and that this is in contrast to Matthew and Luke for whom there is a present kingdom<sup>(174)</sup>. He emphasizes, however, that there is no evidence that Mark connects the kingdom with the defeat of the demonic world; rather is it 'the rule of God over men', and the purpose of Jesus' coming is to bring men into a relationship with God and to promise them a part in the final consummation. He refers to the parousia and the events of chapter 13 only incidentally, as a consummation which is chiefly a reassurance that it was the Son of God who was crucified and that his final triumph is secure. Similarly 14:28 was inserted 'to set the Passion in the light of the eventual triumph of the Resurrection and/or the Parousia' and 'to show that our Lord himself expected the continuance of the fellowship of the disciples both with himself and with one another'<sup>(175)</sup>. In his discussion of chapter 13 the tensions depicted are taken as arising from persecution, war, and false preachers, as well perhaps as the demonic, if *το βδελυγμα της ερημωσης* refers to Anti-Christ. In Best's view, although Mark probably received all three types of Son of man sayings from the tradition, his gospel is primarily concerned with the Son of God whom men killed, and Jesus is the Son of man who deals with sin either through forgiveness or punishment. Thus the chief significance of the parousia sayings is seen in the judicial functions of the Son of man<sup>(176)</sup>.

While Robinson and Best pay too little heed to the parousia, it might be alleged that the view which is set out here does not adequately explain the large emphasis, both in reiterated prophecy and in detailed description, which Mark lays upon the passion. If Mark's message is that after John had prepared the way, the sequence of events pertaining to the End began with the baptism of Jesus and will reach their climax and conclusion in the coming of the Son of man and the gathering of the elect, what decisive part in the message does the suffering and death of Jesus play? The answer to this question would seem to be that Mark sees the experience of John the Baptist, the life and death of Jesus, and the sufferings



and persecution of Christians as three aspects of the same divinely decreed fate of those who are God's servants. This does not mean that the three cycles of experience are identical or that they each have the same meaning. John is the fore-runner; Jesus is the Son of God; Christians live in the period between the cross and the parousia. Yet Mark underlines the similarities. The coming of John as Elijah and the way men wreaked their will on him is linked with the suffering of the Son of man, and both are set in the framework of the fulfilment of scripture - 'how is it written of the Son of man' and 'even as it is written of him (Elijah)' (9:11-13), and it is in line with this that the death of John is given such prominence in a book which otherwise deals exclusively with the actions of Jesus (6:14-29)<sup>(177)</sup>. The sufferings of the disciples are frequently alluded to, and this is set against the background of the suffering of the Son of man, indeed, is depicted as suffering with the Son of man (8:27 - 9:1 and 10:32-40). The parallels drawn by R.H. Lightfoot between chapter 13 and the passion narrative would support this view<sup>(178)</sup>. Lightfoot suggested that the first fulfilment of the predictions in chapter 13 was the passion 'which was itself regarded as a sign, a seal or assurance, and a sacrament of the ultimate fulfilment', and on this score he regarded 13:30 as less difficult than is usually supposed. This may go too far in sacramentalism and symbolism, for Mark certainly held that the parousia would be a fact occurring during the lifetime of some at least of Jesus' contemporaries. It would be better, as suggested above, to speak of a sequence of eschatological events within which are to be found three cycles of experience. Moreover, there is no evidence to suggest that Mark, like John, saw the exaltation of the Son of man as coinciding with the moment of his death upon the cross. It may be that the veil of the temple (15:38) refers to the curtain in front of the holy of holies, so that its rending indicates that the barrier between God and man was broken down at the moment of Christ's death, and also that the comment of the centurion was intended to be the confession of the firstfruits of the Gentiles<sup>(179)</sup>, but these are recognitions of the person of Jesus and not of any change in his status or of his final glorification.

It may be felt that such an interpretation seriously impairs the theological importance of the death of Christ, yet the question must be asked whether in fact Mark attributed great soteriological



significance to it. Apart from 10:45 and 14:24 there are no utterances of Jesus which suggest that he did. Rather the crucifixion is depicted as the climax of persecution (cf. 8:31; 9: 12, 31; 10:33-34) and in the passion narrative of this gospel more so than in any of the others it is the sufferings of Jesus that are stressed<sup>(180)</sup>. Although it is the Son of God who is suffering in this way, his suffering is nevertheless linked with that of his followers. This is so of the cup and baptism of 10:38, which are usually interpreted of the suffering of Jesus and which James and John are to share (10:39). The service which culminates in the 'ransom for many' is not distinct from the service which the disciples are to give (10:43-45). The first prediction of the passion is closely followed by the call for the disciple to take up his cross and follow Jesus (8:31, 34), and although the crucifixion is not expressly mentioned here it is inconceivable that Mark wrote 'and be killed' without having the cross in mind. The gospel is written against a background of persecution (cf. the addition of 'with persecutions' in 10:30), and even if 13:5-13 does not, as Marxsen would have it, depict the situation of the primitive community whom Mark is addressing<sup>(181)</sup>, this persecution is nevertheless akin to the suffering which Jesus had to endure. This lack of emphasis in Mark on the saving effectiveness of the death of Jesus is reflected in the way Jesus by his own authority as Son of man forgives sins (2:1-12). Sin can be forgiven before the death of Jesus and is not dependent upon any results coming from the cross. We conclude, therefore, that there is no evidence in Mark for interpreting the death of Jesus as the victory over Satan and the forces of evil and that sacrificial ideas have a minor place, being derived more from the tradition than from Mark's own theology. For Mark himself the suffering and death of Jesus are part of the predestined eschatological event and the resurrection is only an anticipatory victory. The final victory is the coming of the kingdom of God and the parousia of the Son of man.



Chapter IVTHE TEACHING GIVEN TO THE DISCIPLES II

In the previous chapter what has been examined is that teaching addressed to the disciples which refers in the main to historical events, and it has been argued that Mark believed the life of John the Baptist, the ministry of Jesus, the Cross and the Resurrection, and the final coming of the kingdom of God to be one single eschatological event, predetermined by God and speedily moving to its climax. It has been noted in passing that this was set against a background of persecution and was linked with a call to rigorous discipleship. It is now necessary to consider in further detail this second strand in the teaching of Jesus as Mark has presented it.

Two recent studies of this material provide a point of departure. In the course of his interpretation of the message of Mark, Quesnell draws attention to what he calls 'universal moral directives'. He first isolates such sayings by the application of form criticism and sets out five types:

- (a) those introduced by 'whoever ...' (8:35, 38; 9:37, 41, 42; 10:11, 15, 43, 44);
- (b) those phrased conditionally - 'if anyone ...' (8:34; 9:35, 43, 45, 47; 10:12);
- (c) those phrased negatively (10:29-30, and perhaps also 9:39);
- (d) universal moral imperatives (9:50; 10:14);
- (e) implicit exhortations phrased as universal teaching (8:36, 37; 10:23, 24, 25).

In addition 10:5-9 and 17-21 are the answers to questions which elicit moral instruction<sup>(1)</sup>.

How much stress should be placed upon the form of these sayings is uncertain. Although the approach bears certain similarities to Alt's fruitful study of laws in the Old Testament<sup>(2)</sup>, it may not be equally valid in application to the New Testament. The situation in the Old Testament period was very different in that there was more opportunity for the development of stereotyped forms within the longer periods of tradition, and the kind of material which was being transmitted was different. This part of Quesnell's work does, however, draw attention to a group of sayings which present ethical teaching. Further, all these sayings apart from 10:5-9 and 17-21, which are not really moral directives in the sense in which



Quesnell has initially used the term, are addressed to the disciples. Moreover they are largely confined to the section 8:27 - 10:52 which he, along with many other scholars, regards as a special section of the gospel. He recognizes certain similar imperatives after 10:52 (e.g. 11:22-24, 25; 12:17, 29-31, 43-44 and parts of chapter 13), but of these he apparently accepts only 11:25 as a genuine universal directive<sup>(3)</sup>. In the first part of the gospel there are very few sayings of this kind<sup>(4)</sup>, and while there is a considerable amount of exhortation and moral teaching in the gospel as a whole, the universal moral directives and the positive teaching in general have been collected in this central section. This is due to the Markan redaction<sup>(5)</sup>.

Having established this arrangement of the material in Mark, Quesnell points out the connexions between the imperatives and the other two main themes which he detects in 8:27 - 10:52, the identity of Jesus as the Son of God and the coming fate which awaits him on the cross, both of which are revealed either directly by Jesus himself or through special revelation<sup>(6)</sup>. The major part of the moral directives is intimately linked with the predictions of the passion (8:31; 9:31; 10:32-34). On each occasion the disciples misunderstand the meaning of the prediction and Jesus corrects them, giving an explanation of what following the crucified one really implies. All the other teaching up to 10:52 carries forward the same theme, with the possible exception of the pericope on divorce (10:1-12), and even this, he suggests, might be fitted in if Christ is thought of as the bridegroom<sup>(7)</sup>. Thus 'at least then for 8:27 - 10:52 an over-all pattern of moral teaching which stands in an intimate relation of dependence with regard to the destiny of the cross and of salvation through the cross is unmistakeable and characteristic'<sup>(8)</sup>.

This observation leads on to Quesnell's theory that the first half of the gospel, with its theme of the disciples' failure to understand the teaching, work and identity of Jesus, is part of an intricate plan whereby Mark wishes to lead his readers beyond a superficial understanding of the passion and resurrection and the kind of discipleship which this involves, to a full understanding which is ultimately sacramental. In the first part of the book the Christian reader would feel superior to the first disciples



because he knows who Jesus is while they did not, but after the predictions of the passion and the subsequent rebukes and teaching he begins to question whether he has really understood after all. 'Has he made and begun to execute in his own life the absolute decisions which true understanding of the mystery of the cross and true appreciation of the identity of Jesus logically entail?' This makes him open to the teaching now directed at him, and the message is finally confirmed by the narrative in chapters 14 - 16<sup>(9)</sup>.

It is easy to raise objections to the insistence of Quesnell, which is connected with his analysis, that bread has central symbolic significance for Mark<sup>(10)</sup>. Despite the double account of the feeding miracle (6:35-44; 8:1-9) and the emphasis placed upon the meaning of the loaves (8:14-21, cf. 6:52), together with obvious eucharistic allusions<sup>(11)</sup>, to find the key to the whole gospel in 6:52 is to lay more weight upon a single verse than it can sustain. Indeed, Quesnell really fails to explain why this verse should be central to the interpretation of the gospel.

Questions must also be raised about the more modest claim that Mark's purpose was to provide teaching. We have seen reason to doubt whether he ever intended to portray Jesus as a teacher in the modern sense of the word, although it became clear that the instruction given to the disciples was important for his presentation of Jesus. To the extent, therefore, that Quesnell directs his attention to that secret instruction and refuses to isolate it from the other themes in the gospel, the identity of Jesus and his sufferings and death, he is on the right lines. What is more doubtful is whether Mark devised the over-elaborate and highly sophisticated method of teaching which Quesnell suggests. Though one may seldom claim to have entered so completely into a past age as to be able to pronounce what was or what was not possible in it, it is difficult to believe that Quesnell's picture of Mark's method and purpose in writing his gospel accords with what can be discovered from other sources of the first century church. It looks much too like a highly developed pedagogic technique to fit easily into that society. Nevertheless, by drawing attention to those sayings which he terms universal moral directives and by linking them closely with the predictions of the passion Quesnell has certainly advanced the study of Mark's gospel.



Replloh's conclusions are somewhat similar, although he arrives at them by a different route. Starting from the now familiar assumption of redaction criticism that Mark was writing specifically for the Christian community of which he was a member, and probably a leader, he claims to be able to detect the characteristics of that community from a careful analysis of the alterations and additions which Mark makes to his traditional material. It is a church which is being persecuted or is under the threat of persecution; it is a church in which a hierarchy is developing and where some members are becoming rich and others are seeking power; and there is a failure to understand the parables of Jesus and a reluctance to accept suffering which goes with an opposition to teaching about self-sacrifice<sup>(12)</sup>.

Mark's purpose, therefore, is to teach his community. In the first part of the gospel (1:14 - 8:26) the disciples are presented as representatives of the Christians to whom he addresses his work. Special emphasis is placed upon discipleship. 1:14-15 is a key to understanding the gospel: through the words and deeds of Jesus the community should come to faith in him<sup>(13)</sup>. The pericopae which contain the account of the call of the disciples (1:16-20), the appointment of the Twelve (3:13-19), and the mission in which they carry out the actions of Jesus (6:6b-13, 30) are directly applicable to the community<sup>(14)</sup>. The failure of the disciples to understand Jesus, which is stressed in this section of the gospel, is not final but leads to understanding; in a similar way the Christians of Mark's day do not understand the parables or the meaning of the events in the life of Jesus, especially the loaves which reveal Jesus as the bread of life, present within the congregation, and Mark is writing to give them this understanding<sup>(15)</sup>.

The second section (8:27 - 10:52) contains the teaching which Mark wishes to give. Embraced within the episode at Caesarea Philippi (8:27-33) and the healing of Bartimaeus who provides a final example of one who followed in the way to Jerusalem and the cross (10:46-52), the teaching chiefly shows that discipleship means following Jesus in the way of the cross in face of the expected or actual persecution and in not being ashamed of him and accepting the way of service (8:34 - 9:1; 9:33-50; 10:35-45)<sup>(16)</sup>. Besides this main theme Mark adds instruction for the life of the congregation in matters which were current problems: marriage and divorce (10:2-12),



the importance of children (10:13-16), the dangers of riches (10:17-27), and the place of prayer in the battle against demons (9:14-29)<sup>(17)</sup>.

The study is based upon a minute examination of the relevant passages with the object of discovering Mark's redactional activity and merits close study<sup>(18)</sup>. Nevertheless, apart from some questionable details of exegesis, especially of chapter 10, the theory contains two serious weaknesses. In the first place Reploh is highly selective in his use of the material. He omits the eschatological teaching almost entirely, passing over even 8:38 and 9:1 as simply underlining the seriousness of the judgement already coming on the disciples and the crisis of the present time<sup>(19)</sup>, while chapter 13 is hardly considered at all. This produces a perspective which is fore-shortened by the impending persecution rather than by the imminent parousia, and makes of chapter 10 instructions for an on-going church. More seriously he fails to account for the fact that Mark wrote a 'life' of Jesus; for however much stress is placed upon the fact that Mark's framework is redactional and that his chronological and geographical terms are primarily theological, and however ready we may be to accept the view so forcibly expressed by Marxsen that Mark is writing a εὐαγγέλιον, there is no escaping the form in which Mark presents his message as a narrative which tells the story of Jesus from his baptism to his crucifixion and the empty tomb, and however unsatisfactory the joints may be they are intended to link the episodes and not to separate them. A narrative is not the most obvious form to adopt if the intention is to give instructions to a persecuted and quarrelling congregation; the letter was a well-known medium.

A further difficulty is of more general concern and attaches to Quesnell's interpretation as well as Reploh's. Both writers attempt to integrate the teaching and the passion narrative, Quesnell rather more explicitly than Reploh in finding in chapters 14 - 16 the seal, as it were, set upon the eucharistic teaching. Reploh bases the call to the acceptance of service and suffering upon the way trodden by the Master himself and stresses that the Christian life is Nachfolge. Both writers assume that the outline of the crucifixion will be known to Mark's readers and that Mark is writing his gospel in this knowledge; both also are embarrassed by chapter 13, and both should have been embarrassed by the amount of narrative in the gospel. In fact these



two careful studies of the teaching found in Mark illustrate the need for an analysis which will account not only for the rather one-sided teaching which is found in the gospel and the odd use of the word 'teacher' as applied to Jesus, but which will also integrate satisfactorily into a single interpretation of Mark's purpose the sayings to which they have drawn attention, the eschatological teaching and the narrative sections of the gospel.

In the teaching two features are striking, the small amount of the material and its narrow range. Whether this was all that was contained in Mark's tradition or whether he made a selection from a wider collection, he has included an extremely small number of sayings which can be described even in a very general way as ethical. As already shown, many of the pronouncement stories which have been regarded as central passages from which to derive the teaching of Jesus are not used by Mark for this purpose, although they are so used by the other synoptic writers. When he wishes to draw out ethical teaching from such stories he adds teaching given to the disciples, and Reploh's description of these additions as commentary is apt. This is fully in accord with Mark's theory of 'parables' which require explanations if they are to be understood. This type of ethical teaching, however, is rarely added to the conflict stories. Quesnell and Reploh make an important point when they draw attention to the way in which most of this teaching is attached to the three predictions of the passion. The ethical teaching in Mark is, therefore, a special type of teaching, and the quantity of it is small. Thus Quesnell sets out only twenty-four true 'universal moral directives', to which he adds with considerable hesitation some thirty further sayings, many of which are not primarily ethical<sup>(20)</sup>. Reploh's study is based essentially upon rather less than seventy verses<sup>(21)</sup>. With an extremely wide interpretation of 'ethical' about 55 sayings might on our reckoning be included in this category, to which perhaps the story of the Rich Man and the interpretation of the parable of the Sower might be added<sup>(22)</sup>, i.e. less than a third of the total number of sayings which Mark includes.

The range of this teaching is exceedingly narrow. Thus Reploh discusses the teaching under seven heads: taking up one's cross (8:34 - 9:1), becoming last of all (9:33-50), becoming servant of all (10:35-45), marriage and divorce (10:2-12), the importance of children



in the community (10:13-16), riches (10:17-27), and the prayer of the community in the battle against demons (9:14-29), to which he adds the question of reward for following Jesus (10:28-31). Some of these sections contain a number of somewhat disparate topics, but Reploh's concentration on the redactional elements (as providing the clearest insight into Mark's intentions) tends to narrow the range of issues which he considers. It is not easy to classify Quesnell's universal moral directives, but they can be grouped under self-denial, especially the danger of riches (8:34, 35, 36, 37, 38; 9:43, 45, 47; 10:23, 24, 25), the reversal of worldly position (9:35; 10:43, 44), reward (9:41; 10:29-30), children (9:37; 10:14, 15; cf. 9:42), divorce (10:11, 12), and three miscellaneous sayings about exorcists who do not belong to the group of Christ's disciples (9:39), giving a cup of cold water (9:41), and salt (9:50).

Such classifications, however, are misleading in that they suggest a greater amount of positive teaching in Mark than is the case. Many of these sayings are general exhortations, any specific content for which has to be supplied. An example of this is the sayings about stumbling<sup>(23)</sup>.

The word occurs six times, always in sayings addressed to the disciples (4:17; 9:42, 43, 45, 47; 14:27). In 14:27 it refers to the disciples' desertion of Jesus at his arrest, perhaps with overtones that this showed their loss of faith in him<sup>(24)</sup>. Arndt and Gingrich translate the verb 'cause to be caught or to fall, i.e. cause to sin', and add that the sin may consist of a breach of the moral law, unbelief, or the acceptance of false teaching<sup>(25)</sup>. The sayings in chapter 9 have been taken in more than one way, and while there is fairly general agreement that 9:42 refers to the shaking of a believer's faith in Jesus<sup>(26)</sup>, the sayings in which hand, foot or eye 'cause to stumble' are variously interpreted as implying moral demands<sup>(27)</sup>, or as teaching that the kingdom of God is worth any sacrifice<sup>(28)</sup>. All recognize that no specific sin is mentioned, although Nineham on 6:3 claims that by Mark's time 'Christians were applying (the verb) almost as a technical term to those who, when confronted by Christ, found something in him which prevented them from going on to full Christian faith and discipleship'<sup>(29)</sup>. This may be true, but 'full Christian faith and discipleship' has to be filled out with concrete requirements. Thus even on Quesnell's and



Reploh's views both the quantity and the range of positive and specific ethical teaching included by Mark in his gospel are very limited, and the extent to which Mark intended even this material to be teaching on ethics may have been exaggerated by them.

The central section of the gospel contains the main body of teaching addressed to the disciples, and within this Mark has attached an important part of this to the three predictions of the passion. Thus the first prediction (8:31-33) leads on to 8:34 - 9:1, which is to be seen (so Reploh, correctly) as a connected unity presenting a call to follow Christ in the way of suffering as far as martyrdom. The prophecy of the suffering of the Son of man provides the basis for this teaching, and ἡπαρνησασθαι ἑαυτον is not to be understood of an ascetic ideal of self denial, but as in its concrete use in 14:30, 31, 72 of 'surrender of life' <sup>(30)</sup>. Reploh finds the distinctive Markan elements in και του ευαγγελιου , και τους εμους λεγους , εν τη γενεα ταυτη τη μοιχαλιδι και ἀμαρτωλω and in όταν as linking the coming of the Son of man to the previous section. In his view Mark has added 8:36-37 and 8:38 - 9:1 to the sayings in 8:34-35 to which they form a commentary, and this has the effect of stressing the threat of damnation for those who seek to preserve their lives during a time of persecution and the offer of salvation to those who risk their lives in following Christ. Any metaphorical interpretation of taking up the cross is excluded (contrast Luke who adds καθ' ἡμεραν ), and the reference to the imminent coming of the day of the Son of man emphasizes the importance of the present as the time in which the decision between salvation and judgement falls. Thus the background of persecution is clear. The taking up of the cross is linked with the death of Jesus and signifies martyrdom. In this setting vv.36-37 stress the value of life, for which nothing is an adequate replacement, over against the value of the world. The disciple must give up everything for an existence which lives and hopes in God's salvation <sup>(31)</sup>

On this analysis, although loyalty to Christ and to the Christian faith is demanded, what it means to follow Christ is not explained in religious or ethical terms. The disciple is simply called upon to remain true, even at the cost of his life. The essential contrast is between committing apostasy and dying for the name of Christian, and all efforts to fill out the concepts of 'denying oneself' or



'gaining the whole world' are beside the point<sup>(32)</sup>.

The passage, however, is not simply one more illustration of the way in which sayings that appear at first to be ethical teaching turn out on closer examination to be devoid of specific ethical content. It also points to the necessity for their interpretation of keeping in mind Mark's overall plan of divinely ordered events. What gives these demands their urgency is the coming of the Son of man as imminent (8:38; 9:1). Reploh is in doubt whether persecution is a present reality or is simply anticipated. On our understanding, the persecution envisaged belongs to the period of great distress which immediately precedes the End (cf. 13:9-13). Whatever present trials his readers may have to face, Mark is thinking in 8:34 - 9:1 of the final time of testing which he believes is fast approaching, and in which everything will depend upon the Christian's total commitment to Christ. The disciple will then have to replicate the sufferings of Jesus, and his final destiny will depend upon how he comes through this period of trial<sup>(33)</sup>. Some will suffer martyrdom, others will survive until the coming of the kingdom of God.

The second prediction (9:31) introduces a somewhat looser collection of material derived from the tradition: the dispute about greatness (9:33-37), the strange exorcist (9:38-40), and a collection of sayings compiled apparently on a catchword basis (9:41-50)<sup>(34)</sup>.

The dispute about greatness is one of the most tangled passages in the gospels. It seems to bear some relation to the blessing of the children in 10:13-16 (cf. Mt 18:1-5) and to the sayings found in 10:43-45/Mt 20:26-28; Mt 10:40; 23:11; Lk 9:48; 10:16; 22:26, and is commonly held to be a Markan construction<sup>(35)</sup>. To understand Mark's intention it is necessary to refrain from importing ideas from the other gospels. Taken on its own there is no indication that Mark was concerned with the humility of a child (perhaps as Matthew), far less with its innocence; nor should the suggestion that 10:15 is more appropriate here lead to an attempt to reconstruct a hypothetical original incident<sup>(36)</sup>. The point of the story as Mark tells it lies in the attitude of others towards the child. According to Cranfield the connexion of thought is that Jesus declared true greatness to consist in humble service and then proceeded to give an example of such service, adding that this service given to a child is accepted as being done to Jesus himself and that service to Jesus is accepted as being rendered to God<sup>(37)</sup>. Reploh notes the elaborate



redactional editing in 9:33-37: the reference to the private teaching 'in the house', the initial question by Jesus, the statement that they had been disputing 'in the way', the Markan designation 'the Twelve', the double calling together of the disciples (vv. 33, 35), and the addition of the saying about receiving a child with an introduction apparently derived from 10:13-16. He argues that the two logia in vv. 35 and 37 are floating sayings which Mark has worked into the present construction for the express purpose of teaching leaders in the community who were forcefully exerting their authority and stirring up strife that the way of Christ was to be the way of his followers also. The little child is a type of those who are without protection and Jesus, in receiving it, exhibits how he was 'last of all' and 'servant of all'. Thus the message which Mark wishes to teach is: 'Gross ist im Sinne Jesu der, der aller Letzter und Diener aller wird, der dies ausweist gerade an seinem Verhalten armen und hilfsbedürftigen Kindern gegenüber'. In placing the incident immediately after the prediction of the passion Mark shows that this problem in the community can be solved by looking at Jesus on the way to the cross<sup>(38)</sup>.

Whether the saying in v.35 means that the essence of true greatness is to be found in service is, however, doubtful. The natural way of taking the Greek is as an announcement of judgement - the man who seeks pre-eminence will be made last of all and servant of all in the kingdom of God<sup>(39)</sup> - and so as an assertion of the reversal of position in the future age. The emphasis in v.37 is to be placed upon receiving the child 'in my name' and the acceptance of such an action as being done to Jesus and ultimately to God. Even if the well-known Jewish legal principle that a man's representative or envoy is as the man himself is invoked<sup>(40)</sup>, the meaning of the saying remains obscure. *Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* may mean 'when my name is confessed, when I am called upon' and indicate that the child is a believer, with a possible allusion to baptism ('because my name has been invoked over him'). On the other hand it may mean 'for my sake', in the sense 'because this action is what I desire or even 'because the child in his human need is my representative'<sup>(41)</sup>. In what sense the child is 'received' is uncertain; most commentators interpret in some such sense as 'welcome', 'care for', 'show kindness to', 'receive in baptism'<sup>(42)</sup>. Nineham suggests that the original



saying referred to Jesus' disciples and that the Aramaic verb ܠܫܡܐ meant both 'to receive' and 'to hear, obey' (cf. Mt 10:14; Lk 10:8, 10)<sup>(43)</sup>, but it is difficult to fit this into the Markan context.

Black's suggestion that the original saying was a mashal based on the double meaning of the Aramaic ܡܫܠܐ as 'child' and 'servant'<sup>(44)</sup> is also difficult to accept as adequate to Mark's pericope since it fails to account for the form of v.37, although it provides a link between the idea of service and the 'taking' of the παῖδες.

Perhaps no connexion between vv. 33-35 and 36-37 is to be looked for and they are really independent items in a collection of teaching which Mark has put together in this chapter on a catchword basis. If so, vv. 33-35 might teach the reversal of earthly position in the future kingdom, while the incident of the little child makes the quite different point that Jesus stands as the representative of God and the 'little child' (either a believer or a person in need) stands as the representative of Jesus. On this interpretation there is a partial parallel to 9:33-35 in 10:31; Mt 23:12 and Lk 14:11; 18:14, and rather less certain analogies to 9:36-37 in 9:41 and Mt 25:31-46, with the content of 'receive' left undefined. Certainly it is difficult to find any plain ethical teaching in these sayings.

The incident of the strange exorcist (9:38-40) need not be treated at length. Exorcism was practised by Jesus and the early church and by Jews and pagans, and Acts 19:13-16 provides an example of non-Christian use of the name of Jesus in such exorcisms. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the story was preserved in the tradition in order to offer guidance about the Christian's attitude toward such exorcists. Reploh argues that the pericope as it came to Mark consisted of vv. 38-39 and that vv. 40-42 are Mark's own commentary on the theme<sup>(45)</sup>. The background of the latter verses is no longer that of a rigorist group who ask how they should behave towards those who work miracles in the name of Jesus without counting themselves as members of the church, but is that of fierce persecution in which the church's very existence is threatened, and where anyone who does not openly oppose members of the Christian community basically supports them. V.41 would then indicate that the disciples are in such a wretched condition that simply to give one of them a cup of water earns great merit. Thus Mark would be teaching that the disciples should see in the account of the strange exorcist support



for the view that anyone who does not actively oppose them is on their side.

The arguments for thinking that the section vv.38-50 has been built up from originally separate fragments of tradition and that the catchword principle has played a dominant part in its formation are strong<sup>(46)</sup>. It is also probable that vv.40 and 41 formed no part of the original pericope about the exorcist<sup>(47)</sup>. Whether vv.40-42 imply a background of persecution is contested. Many have interpreted the verses in a purely moral sense, and the giving of the cup of water as an example of service and the stumbling as temptation to sin<sup>(48)</sup>. Nineham at least recognizes that the section is relevant to the circumstances of the persecuted church<sup>(49)</sup>. More attention, however, might be given to the words ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔστε<sup>(50)</sup>. The reward is promised, not for a simple humanitarian action but for help given to a Christian<sup>(51)</sup>. If the accumulation of sayings by means of catchwords represents more than the mere mechanical juxtaposition of separate phrases, and the compiler saw an intrinsic connexion between them, a consistent train of thought may be detected here even if not a developed argument. Vv.38 and 40 suggest that those who give the cup of water are non-Christians. Whether a situation of persecution is envisaged (so Reploh) depends upon the emphasis which is placed upon certain key phrases, such as 'speak evil of me', 'against us', and whether a very minor act of kindness involved in giving a cup of water becomes sufficiently important to be singled out for a reward in the future kingdom because the hostility towards the members of the church is so severe. It is probable that persecution is reflected here, particularly when it is so elsewhere in Mark's gospel, but this does not mean that Mark included the incident of the strange exorcist solely for this purpose<sup>(52)</sup>. If it is correct that Mark believed that the eschatological sequence of events was taking place even as he was writing, the links between the exorcism and persecution are much closer. Both are parts of the final conflict which precedes the parousia.

The sayings about stumbling which follow have already been examined<sup>(53)</sup>. It was argued there that σκανδαλίζειν is a colourless word which has to be given a content derived from the wider situation of Mark and his readers before the sayings have any real meaning and that they do not primarily present ethical teaching. It is now necessary to observe their place within the overall structure of the



chapter that Mark has compiled, possibly incorporating a collection of sayings which had already been put together. Reploh, accepting the arrangement as clearly due to the catchword principle, adjudges the sequence of thought to be loose, and finds no hint of persecution in vv.43-48, which comprise simply a radical call to fight against temptation and error. Similarly the sayings in vv.49-50 are linked to v.48 by 'fire' and to one another by 'salt', but he thinks that v.49 may refer to persecution, and that the concluding 'be at peace with one another' is Markan and refers back to the problem of strife within the community<sup>(54)</sup>. Here Reploh's over-emphasis upon the situation in Mark's own church has distorted Reploh's understanding of the passage. The note of urgency in the call to sacrifice hand, foot or eye if these lead to 'stumbling' is provided by the reference to a (future) 'life' (vv.43, 45) and to the kingdom of God (v.47), terms which must be synonymous in this passage and which are in contrast to 'Gehenna' (probably thought of as a place of destruction rather than of torment). This is closely related to the eschatological scheme elsewhere in this gospel and continues the idea of threat and reward in v.41 and underlying v.42. Moreover, although they are of very uncertain meaning and their original setting and significance has been entirely lost, the sayings about salt can be fitted into this without undue strain<sup>(55)</sup>. The salting with fire could have been taken by Mark in reference to the period of testing and persecution which he thought would precede the End<sup>(56)</sup>. In its present context, and apart from the overtones derived from Matthew and Luke, v.50 is attached less artificially to the previous verse than is generally believed. Here is a somewhat violent change of metaphor, but within a context of testing and judgement v.50a.b might well have been for Mark a warning to maintain the Christian character and allegiance during the period before the parousia<sup>(57)</sup> rather than a statement of a quality possessed by the disciples 'seasoning' the daily life around them<sup>(58)</sup>, and v. 50c may continue the same theme: 'instead of allowing yourselves to become salt which has lost its saltiness, take care to maintain in yourselves that which is the saltiness of the salt'<sup>(59)</sup>.

The various attempts to analyze 10:35-45, the sayings following the third prediction of the passion, and to determine the original incident in the life of Jesus need not be discussed here<sup>(60)</sup>. Although the passage can be read as a single incident it contains



four somewhat disparate themes which have been derived by some from independent sources, the prophecy about the cup and baptism (vv.38-39)<sup>(61)</sup>, the statement that God alone has decreed who shall have the chief places at the parousia (v.40)<sup>(62)</sup>, teaching about the importance of service within the Christian community (vv.42-44)<sup>(63)</sup>, and one of the only two verses in the gospel which offer any theological explanation of the death of Jesus (v.45)<sup>(64)</sup>.

Reploh accepts the passage as composite but attempts to find a unity of thought in it by emphasizing the themes of suffering and martyrdom in discipleship. On form-critical grounds he divides it initially into two parts, vv.35-40 and 41-45. In the traditional material which came to Mark the answer to the disciples' questions was to be found in vv. 38a and 40, into which Mark inserted vv. 38b - 39 where the cup and baptism are metaphors for suffering in the first place, although after the resurrection they were also applied to Jesus' death. Mark's intention was to teach the Christian community the way of radical discipleship in following Jesus as far as martyrdom. The addition reduced the saying about the seats in the kingdom (v.40) to minor significance. V.41 begins a fresh theme, since while vv.35-40 deal with places of honour in the kingdom vv.41-45 concern chief positions among the disciples on earth. Mark attached a saying which had no fixed position in the tradition (vv.43-44) to the pericope about James and John by constructing vv.41-42a, and brought it into firm connexion with the death of Jesus by adding v.45b which is 'eine christologische/soteriologische Interpretation' absent from the similar passage in Lk 22:24-27. On the basis of this reconstruction of the history of the pericope Reploh suggests that there was a crisis in Mark's church in which indignation, anger and mistrust flamed out (cf. vv.41, 42a), and the leaders attempted to obtain positions of power and prestige (hence the emphasis given to James and John, leaders among the disciples). Mark meets this situation by setting out the way of discipleship in suffering. Following the way of Jesus as far as death is the ultimate realization of becoming last of all and servant of all<sup>(65)</sup>.

We have already seen reasons to question the validity of attempts to discover details about the community to which Mark belongs and for which he is writing from an analysis of the way he presents the narrative of the ministry of Jesus, and to reject the theory that Mark



wrote his gospel in order to instruct the members of that community. In his exegesis of this pericope Reploh seriously undervalues the importance which the parousia has both here and in Mark's thought generally. Mark expects a speedy end of the present age and the imminent return of Jesus to establish his kingdom, which he identifies with the coming of the kingdom of God. Otherwise than in Reploh's interpretation v.40 must be taken with full seriousness as the climax of the first part of the pericope. There will be places of honour in the kingdom reserved by God for those predestined to receive them. This does not mean, however, that those who will be given these seats will have power on earth. The reversal of values already expressed in chapter 9 underlies Mark's understanding of Jesus' teaching. As the Son of man was a servant who drank the cup of suffering, received the baptism of pain and death, and gave up his life as a means of atonement, so his followers will have to pass through similar sufferings and render the same kind of humble service. The passage does not give direct teaching about the way Christians should behave within the church, and does not imply the continuing existence of that Christian community through a period of history. It is rather part of the general theme of recapitulation found in this gospel. Jesus as the Son of man lives as a servant, suffers, is killed, and will come as glorious Lord. In the same way the disciples are to live as servants, will suffer in the persecutions which will reach their climax in the period preceding the parousia, and will then share the splendour of the kingdom with the Son of man.

Reploh takes the three groups of sayings attached to the predictions of the passion as together expressing the way of discipleship which involves following Jesus to the cross. This is an important part of the truth, but it needs to be placed within the wider viewpoint of the eschatological drama. It is the way of the Son of man that is the way of suffering and death to final triumph when he comes in the glory of his Father, and Mark holds that his disciples must tread the same road through the sufferings which precede the End to their final joy in the kingdom. The contrast between the present age and the future kingdom dominates the teaching. It is the glorious Son of man who suffers and is the servant of all. Similarly the Christian must deny himself and lose his life if he is to be honoured in the kingdom.



The rest of the sayings addressed to the disciples remain to be considered. In the central section of the gospel, apart from the statement following the healing of the epileptic boy, 'This kind can come out by nothing save by prayer' (9:29), this is concentrated in 10:1-31<sup>(66)</sup>.

This is a passage characterized by E. Schweizer as a catechism which sets out discipleship in marriage, in relation to children, and in relation to possessions<sup>(67)</sup>, and by Reploh with the title 'Realization of discipleship in the life of the community',<sup>(68)</sup> as presenting teaching upon issues which were of central importance in Mark's church. Both writers find a special unity in the chapter even though made up of independent pericopae without local or temporal setting. They assume that Mark believed the End to be sufficiently distant for catechetical instruction on moral issues to be relevant to his readers. This is an assumption we have questioned, so that it is doubtful whether the section can be regarded simply as presenting ethical teaching. Nevertheless, the pericope about divorce and that of the incident with the rich man are not used by Mark in the same way as the conflict stories in 11:27 - 12:34, both being followed by instruction given to the disciples and thus akin to the teaching in parables which is later explained to the Twelve. Thus it is necessary to consider whether Mark intended to provide ethical teaching at this point and, if he did, why he limited it to the particular issues found here, and how this teaching is related to his wider eschatological interests.

As has been previously noted, Matthew was compelled to introduce far-reaching modifications into the Markan pericope about divorce in order to make of it instruction for his church. By the addition of *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰῶνα* to the Pharisees' question he transformed it into a discussion about the grounds for divorce. He can omit the case of a woman divorcing her husband because he is legislating for a Jewish-Christian community, and he integrates Jesus' reply to the disciples into a single, rabbinic type debate. By reversing the order of the quotations from Genesis and Deuteronomy, and by introducing the latter as a riposte by the Pharisees to Jesus' quotation of Gen 1:27 and 2:24 rather than as a reply to Jesus' question about what Moses had commanded, he has produced a sequence of thought which begins with the basic law in Genesis and then



moves by way of Moses' rule to Jesus' own gloss on that law limiting the grounds for divorce to *πορνεία*. Thus, as Houlden has observed, Matthew is providing legislation for his Christian community in line with the teaching of the school of Rabbi Shammai<sup>(69)</sup>. These changes, and particularly the insertion of the exceptive clause, suggest that Mark's account was found to be impractical when viewed as legislation for the church<sup>(70)</sup>.

What, then, is the relation in Mark's account between the pronouncement story and the teaching given to the disciples? If a parallel is correctly drawn between this teaching and the private instruction which follows the parable of the Sower (4.13-20), the discussion about uncleanness (7:18-23), and the prediction of the destruction of the temple (13:5-37), we must conclude that it is the plain teaching about divorce which is being given in vv. 11-12, where there is an absolute prohibition of divorce, or at least of remarriage after separation, explicitly applied to both partners in the marriage<sup>(71)</sup>. It is his failure to make this distinction between words addressed to the Pharisees and teaching given to the disciples that leads Houlden to misinterpret Mark's intention here, as when he says of the passage that it is 'chiefly a theological statement about marriage. Behind the Deuteronomic concession to human weakness stands Genesis 1:27 - God's original gracious purpose for man, now, in the coming of Jesus, at length to be fulfilled. Paradise is to be re-established', adding that this is teaching about marriage as such and nothing short of the acceptance of God's kingdom will make it possible for man to keep it.<sup>(72)</sup> But Mark is not concerned with proclaiming an ideal or perfectionist ethic, and his view of the kingdom is not that with the coming of Jesus the kingdom has arrived and paradise is established on earth. The kingdom is eschatological and is linked with the imminent parousia. The teaching in vv. 11-12 is unequivocal, but it is not legislation for an ongoing church<sup>(73)</sup>. As Matthew saw, this would be impractical not merely for society at large but even as legislation for the Christian community. Rather it is a rigorist ethic which can be demanded because the interim is short. While the imminence of the End is not explicitly mentioned here, as it is in Paul's discussion of sexual relations in 1 Cor 7<sup>(74)</sup>, the teaching has to be interpreted in the light of Mark's total perspective. There is the same urgency here as is expressed elsewhere in the cutting off of hand or foot, or the gouging out of



an eye if these cause 'stumbling'. For this reason it is also incorrect that Mark presents Jesus as setting out the will of God in an absolute form such as can be completely fulfilled only after the End, in the new world of God's kingdom<sup>(75)</sup>. In 12:25, which as a saying within a pronouncement story is admittedly not strong evidence for Mark's own thought, Jesus asserts that in heaven there is no longer any marriage. Even if this is rejected as reliable evidence, and even if at times it is this-worldly imagery that is used to depict the kingdom (e.g. seats at Jesus' right and left hand, 10:40), there is no hint that this is so here or that the teaching in 10:11-12 is referring to anything other than present earthly and social relationships within the church as it awaits the parousia. Divorce and remarriage can be prohibited because the time is short.

An important feature of the remainder of the section is the frequency with which the kingdom of God is mentioned (vv.14, 15, 23, 24, 25), together with the related concepts of eternal life (vv.17, 30), being saved (v.26), and treasure in heaven (v.21). The idea of reward is not limited to vv. 28-31, as Reploh suggests, but is basic to the whole passage. This is not moral teaching for an ongoing church, still less is it an autonomous ethic. The imminent kingdom of God is fundamental to the thought. This is confirmed when the content of the teaching is examined, which again consists of a rigorist ethical demand.

It is possible to interpret the story of the blessing of the children (10:13-16) as a coherent whole, but it is generally held that v.15 is an isolated saying which has been inserted into the pronouncement story, on the grounds that it has a fresh introduction with phraseology which Mark uses for such sayings, that it expresses a different idea from that found in v.14, and that the narrative is complete without it<sup>(76)</sup>. If this is correct as an analysis of the pericope, it only serves to focus attention on Mark's purpose in completing it in this way. Why the kingdom of God belongs to children has been much debated and a variety of reasons suggested - that they are unselfconscious and receptive<sup>(77)</sup>, that it is not a subjective quality which is pointed to but their objective littleness and helplessness<sup>(78)</sup>, that they evince an unsophistication and freshness<sup>(79)</sup>, that it is God's inscrutable will that those who



have not yet reached the age of the law should inherit the kingdom<sup>(80)</sup>, and that it is the younger generation who will be the generation of the last times and who will live to see the coming of the kingdom<sup>(81)</sup>. Branscomb and Cranfield find here an incipient doctrine of justification by faith, and links have often been made with the later practice of infant baptism<sup>(82)</sup>, though it is very uncertain whether this was in Mark's mind. Even Reploh, who considers that Mark used the traditional story to provide an answer to a question debated in his church about the position and importance of children and whether they belonged to the Christian community, merely suggests that after the introduction of infant baptism the passage might have been used to support the practice<sup>(83)</sup>. In view of Mark's eschatology, it is possible that he understood this pericope as providing another example of the reversal of position which the coming of the kingdom would bring. This would make it parallel to the sayings about the first and the last (10:31), service (9:35; 10:43-45), and the receiving of a little child (9:36-37). It might even be that 10:15 should be translated, 'Whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as one receives a little child', with  $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\epsilon\upsilon$  as an accusative<sup>(83a)</sup>, but although this would bring it into a close relation with 9:37 it is somewhat forced. On the whole the meaning for Mark would seem to be that, since children as insignificant members of society will occupy important positions when the kingdom comes and reverses earthly hierarchies, so those who wish to enjoy the privileges of the kingdom must become as children, accepting humble status.

Previous analysis of the incident of the rich man as a single pericope suggested that Mark had used it not for ethical instruction but for the call to follow Jesus in the way of rigorist discipleship<sup>(84)</sup>. This would seem to be confirmed when it is examined in relation to the section of which it forms a part (10:17-31). The frequent breaks in the narrative and fresh introductions, the apparent change of theme at v.28, and the textual variants in vv.24 and 27 suggest that this is a Markan construction<sup>(85)</sup>. Reconstruction of the tradition which came to Mark or detection of the stages in its development are difficult. The textual variants indicate that copyists found difficulty with the thought of the passage, possibly owing to the presence of wealthy members in their churches, but these do not provide a basis for discovering Mark's own additions to the traditions. Similarly the considerable changes made by Matthew, and to a lesser extent by



Luke, reveal their interests and throw some light upon the emphases which they detected in Mark's account, but they can hardly be used to work back to the pre-Markan source material. Attention will, therefore, be concentrated upon the completed narrative as we have it in 10:17-31.

The whole section is concerned with riches and rewards, vv.23-31 corresponding to the private instruction given to the disciples which follows several other passages in Mark<sup>(86)</sup>. The rich man's question concerns inheriting eternal life (v.17), the second reply by Jesus promises 'treasure in heaven' (v.21), the conversation with the disciples centres on entering the kingdom of God (vv.23, 24, 25) which is apparently paraphrased by 'who can be saved' (v.26), Peter's comment that they have left everything to follow Jesus leads on to the statement that those who have left family or possessions will receive a hundredfold recompense in the present time 'with persecutions' and 'eternal life' in the coming age, thus neatly reverting to the rich man's question (vv.29-30), and the section concludes with an assertion of the reversal of fortunes, presumably in the age to come, which here is surely a promise and not a threat as some have thought<sup>(87)</sup>. A curious feature of the passage is the use of 'eternal life' (not in the Johannine sense but as 'life in the age to come'), 'kingdom of God', 'heaven', and 'the age to come' with closely related if not fully synonymous meaning. This is evidence that Mark regarded the kingdom of God as future and transcendent, belonging to the future age which he expected to be inaugurated with the coming of the Son of man.

The tensions within the section, which have led scholars to posit a long and complicated history for it, make it difficult to be certain where Mark's central emphasis lies. He lays a certain stress upon the rewards which the disciples will receive in the future kingdom, though Matthew, who lays great weight upon the parousia here by inserting the logion of the twelve thrones from which the disciples will judge the tribes of Israel in the *παλιγγενεσία*, clearly felt that Mark had given the rewards in the present time too great prominence for he omits much of 10:30 and makes the rewards entirely future. The curious addition 'with persecutions' (v.30) so qualifies the hundredfold recompense in this world as almost to negate it, but is hardly ironical. The impossibility of



a rich man entering the kingdom (or anyone entering according to one reading in v.24<sup>(88)</sup>) is so emphasized that the astonishment shown by the disciples is fully understandable, but this is retracted in the statement that all things are possible with God. Either, therefore, Mark has simply grouped sayings in a comparatively external manner because of their references to riches and rewards or he saw some inner connexion between them and intended to present through them a single and coherent piece of teaching. Houlden takes the passage as instruction about wealth and judges that Mark here as elsewhere has set the teaching on a theological plane. 'The trouble with riches lay not fundamentally in the moral weakness to which they gave rise but in the impediment they create to the wholeheartedness of a man's acceptance of God's rule (presumably, by giving him another object of trust). They prevent him from entering the kingdom (10:17-27). Observance of the moral law has to be transcended by unfettered attachment to Jesus. This renunciation and attachment brings its own new wealth (10:28-31) - the fellowship and resources of the christian community here and now (changed by Matthew into a purely future, heavenly compensation for stringency on earth)',<sup>(89)</sup>. This judgement is correct in its emphasis on the requirements of complete dedication to the kingdom, but it takes insufficient notice of the addition 'with persecutions' and of the stress upon the future reward which is already present in Mark and not merely introduced by Matthew.

It is often assumed that Mark must be giving teaching which is valid for a church that is to have a continuing existence in the world, even by those who attempt to moderate the harshness of the demand laid upon the rich man by taking it not as a general example but as an individual case<sup>(90)</sup>. Once Mark's eschatological scheme is firmly grasped, however, this harshness falls into place; it voices a rigorist ethic for the interim. The rich man should give away all his possessions because the period before the End is short and what is of supreme importance is to have 'treasure in heaven', to 'enter the kingdom of God', 'to inherit eternal life'. This is the point enlarged upon in the dialogue which follows. Riches are far from being a sign of divine favour and from freeing a man from earthly cares so as to enable him to devote himself to religious exercises and good works<sup>(91)</sup>, as the disciples seem to have thought. Rather they tie the man to the present age<sup>(92)</sup>. How God makes it possible for the rich man to be



saved is not clear; possibly it was through enabling him to part willingly with his wealth<sup>(93)</sup>. Vv.28-31 continue the same theme of abandoning everything and following Jesus. Reploh is correct in seeing the reward as consisting in both the family of the Christian community, persecuted though that community is, and life in the future age, but not so in thinking that the community is the church of Mark's own day<sup>(94)</sup>. The reward is for the interim, and the Christian fellowship is an adequate reward for that period because it is brief. It would be an impractical dream for a long period of continuing history. The age to come is the true reward and Mark believes that this will soon be experienced. The closing verse reiterates the reversal of fortunes which has been noted elsewhere in Mark's gospel and which fits in with this conception. In this passage, therefore, the combination of a rigorist ethic and the eschatology of the imminent coming of the kingdom is close.

The teaching so far considered has consisted mainly of rigorist ethics. There remain a number of sayings which belong less clearly in such a pattern of ethics for the period up to the imminent parousia.

The saying appended to the story of the epileptic boy (9:28-29) might have been passed over were it not cast in the form of private teaching given to the disciples when Jesus had come indoors ( $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\alpha\nu$ ). It belongs to that special, direct teaching which is of such importance in Mark's presentation of Jesus. Cranfield is almost alone in defending the historicity of the incident<sup>(95)</sup>, the majority of commentators regarding the two verses as a Markan construction, either to explain why the disciples failed to expel the demon<sup>(96)</sup>, or to meet the situation in the later church<sup>(97)</sup>. Reploh again provides the fullest discussion<sup>(98)</sup>. Having also argued that these verses are redactional additions by Mark to meet the needs of his own time, and suggesting that Mark used the device of private instruction partly because he saw in the difficulties which the disciples had to face the problems of his own church and partly because there may have been a tradition that Jesus was accustomed to give special instruction in this way, he finds in these verses a reflection of the powerlessness and helplessness of the Christian community in a period of declining enthusiasm when the ability to work powerful miracles had been lost. He explains the contrast between v.23, where the requirements for successful exorcism is faith,



and v.29, where prayer is said to be a necessary condition, by assigning the narrative of the healing to the tradition. Two different situations are then represented in the present text, that of the lifetime of Jesus and that of the Christian community. That community could see itself in the boy's father, and thus faith and prayer are linked, as in 11:20-25. This explains why Mark included this miracle story in the central section of his gospel which is mainly concerned with teaching. Vv.28-29 are Mark's commentary on the pericope and constitute special teaching for his church<sup>(99)</sup>. Granted that in its present form the pericope is a Markan construction these suggestions appear plausible; what they fail to explain, however, is why Mark, writing for a persecuted church (and Reploh reiterates here his view that the church of Mark's day was facing persecution) should be so concerned to maintain the practice of exorcism<sup>(100)</sup>, so that the teaching about exorcism remains unrelated to the central theme of the Nachfolge of Jesus in the way of humility and suffering, and the pericope can be included only somewhat awkwardly among those which deal with concrete questions and current problems of the community<sup>(101)</sup>. Can it be more satisfactorily integrated into the eschatological interpretation of the life of Jesus that we have detected in Mark's gospel?

This involves the wider question of what connexion, if any, there is between exorcisms and a sequence of eschatological events in which suffering and vindication are the focal points<sup>(102)</sup>, for it is curious in the first place that in a gospel in which a relatively large number of exorcisms are described<sup>(103)</sup> only two sayings contain any teaching about the practice (3:23-29; 9:29). It seems fairly certain that the exorcisms were significant for Mark in his presentation of Jesus' character and mission, yet in the teaching he includes the strongest emphasis is laid upon the cross and its vindication in the resurrection and the parousia and little upon the exorcisms. In 3:23-29<sup>(104)</sup> teaching on exorcism is said to be 'in parables', but as no private explanation is added the meaning is difficult to establish. From Mark's account of exorcisms it is plain that, whether he is thought to have won a once for all victory over Satan or has to defeat each demon he meets, Jesus is the strong man who is invincible in his encounters with the demons, and is so in that he can also pass on this authority to his disciples (3:15;



6:7). Moreover, the practice of exorcism in the name of Jesus is taken to mean that even those who do not belong closely to the narrower circle of disciples are essentially on his side (9:38-40). The scope of the exorcisms must, however, be recognized<sup>(105)</sup>. They are not trivial incidents in the early stages of Jesus' ministry before he enters upon the way of suffering and parousia, but are events of cosmic significance. Moreover, they are included in the disciples' recapitulation of the way of Jesus, and although there is no account of any exorcisms performed by John the Baptist, the reason why Herod thought that Jesus was John redivivus is that 'these powers work in him' (6:14), perhaps a hint that at least some traditions held that John had performed miracles<sup>(106)</sup>. The exorcisms could thus be a feature of the eschatological period which began with John and will end with the parousia. Robinson, it is true, emphasizes the cosmic struggle with Satan of which the exorcisms form a part, but he does not relate this cosmic struggle as a whole and in its parts to the total eschatological scheme in Mark, nor does Best do this with the temptation of Jesus which he regards as the occasion of a complete victory over Satan.

In relation to such a scheme, 9:28-29 would be teaching that during the interim before the parousia Christians are to maintain the struggle with evil which takes place partly through the persecutions and testing which precede the End, partly through the conflict with the demons. As private teaching it would be intended to confirm and encourage the practice of exorcism among Mark's readers, though it does not allow such confident assertions about their situation as Reploh makes.

Outside this central section (8:27 - 10:52) there are sundry logia addressed to the disciples. Four occur in the first section, 1:1 - 8:26.

The call of Simon and Andrew contains a saying which expresses in programmatic form the summons to follow Jesus. 'Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men' (1:17). Whatever its historicity or original historical context<sup>(107)</sup>, Mark has placed it in a somewhat formal setting of the first preaching of Jesus (1:14-15), the call of the first disciples (1:16-20) and Jesus' 'teaching' in the synagogue linked with an exorcism (1:21-28). The phrase 'fishers of men' is here apparently used in a good



sense, and has no strict Jewish or hellenistic antecedent, earlier references to fishing having a different connotation, and it is not picked up anywhere else in Mark, or indeed in the New Testament<sup>(108)</sup>. This might argue against the importance attached to it by Replon, that the Twelve in this gospel constitute the counterpart and example of the church in Mark's own day<sup>(109)</sup>. In spite of its position, this saying would appear to be of minor significance for Mark, and, although it signals the beginning of the call of the Twelve who were to receive the plain teaching of Jesus, it was not closely integrated into his eschatological scheme, unless the interpretation is correct that the call is to gather men to the eschatological judgement<sup>(110)</sup>.

The mission charge in Mark is extremely brief (6:8-11). The parallel accounts in Mt 9:35 - 10:42 and Lk 9:1-6 and 10:1-16 indicate a tradition common to Matthew and Luke which also contained such a charge, into which Matthew, and perhaps Luke also, have incorporated other material. That Mark's brevity is due to his having himself abbreviated a longer mission charge in Q rests upon the unproven hypothesis of Mark's knowledge of Q<sup>(111)</sup>. With greater certainty the fresh introductions and alternations from indirect to direct speech may be used to analyze the pericope into the fragments of which it is composed (vv. 7 + 12-13, 8-9, and 10-11, with some doubt about 9a and 9b<sup>(112)</sup>). Comparison with the parallel passage in Lk 10:4-11 (cf. Mt 10:9-14) has suggested that Mark's version is accommodated to Roman conditions<sup>(113)</sup>, but the differences may equally well be due to slightly divergent traditions and there is no certain evidence that they are the work of Mark himself. It appears that Mark has combined two or more sayings into a mission charge for which he has composed the narrative framework.

It will be recalled that for Albert Schweitzer the mission charge, albeit in its Matthaean form and especially Mt 10:23, was the main foundation of his reconstruction of the ministry of Jesus based on an expectation of the imminent coming of the Son of man before the Twelve returned, and, with the failure of this expectation, the decision to go to Jerusalem to suffer<sup>(114)</sup>. In the form in which Schweitzer presented it this reconstruction is recognized to be no longer tenable<sup>(115)</sup>. If, however, Mark has been rightly understood as seeing men standing under the imminence of the parousia with the consequent rigorist ethic of the interim, the



question may be asked whether his conception of the mission charge is not somewhat akin to what Schweitzer postulated on the basis of Matthew. Evidently the situation is one of great urgency; even with the permission of staff and sandals the demands are still rigorous. They and the injunction given in v.10 which does not anticipate a lengthy stay in any one place can hardly be regarded as suited to the conditions of the later church where there would be Christian congregations in many towns among which the missionary might expect to find hospitality<sup>(116)</sup>. Even without the direct reference to the day of judgement found in Mt 10:15/Lk 10:12, the symbolism in 6:11 is dramatic and forceful, pointing to the eschatological judgement, and the call to repentance in 6:12 is reminiscent of Mark's summary of the message of Jesus himself in 1:15. The charge, however, is in no way a turning point in Mark's narrative, and so slight a part does it play in the whole that some have even argued either that Mark lacked detailed traditions about the apostles' mission or that he had little interest in what was for him essentially a minor incident in the ministry of Jesus, since the conditions were Palestinian and had lost their relevance and practicability<sup>(117)</sup>.

In relation, however, to an eschatologically orientated order of events, the mission charge can retain a certain relevance. It stands alongside the rigorist ethic as a feature of the action which is demanded of Christians in the period before the parousia (cf. 13:10). The battle with the demons is to be maintained. The content of the preaching, which Mark mentions only obliquely, is repentance. All is in preparation for the End which is drawing near. The mission charge is brief, but it is sufficient for Mark's purpose. The situation of the church in his own day is not so different from that of the first disciples in the time of Jesus to require much change in the activity of Christian missionaries.

The third section of teaching (7:18-23) is the explanation by Jesus to the disciples of his words about defilement which he had spoken to the crowd after his reply to the question of the Pharisees and scribes why the disciples did not follow the tradition of the elders in matters of ritual purity, which words Mark characterizes as a 'parable'. This is of considerable importance as part of Jesus' teaching to the disciples, if the parallels between 7:14-23 and 4:1-20 are noted and if Mark is rightly judged to have included



the conflict in 7:1-13 as providing stock anti-Jewish polemic, although with little relevance to the conduct of his readers. Whatever the source of vv.18-19 or any possible original meaning, their significance for Mark as he has included them here is to be found in the crucial concluding phrase καθαρίσω πάντα τα βρώματα. Three interpretations of it have been proposed: as a nominative going (falsely) with the accusative ἀφεδρώνει, which is taken to mean 'intestine' - the natural functions of the body treat all food alike or remove the impurity<sup>(118)</sup>; as a Markan comment, grammatically agreeing with the subject of λέγει, stating that this teaching abolishes the distinction between clean and unclean meat<sup>(119)</sup>; as a scribal gloss with the same sense<sup>(120)</sup>. As an addition by Mark it affirms his belief that Jesus had totally abrogated the laws about clean and unclean food, a view which was fiercely contested by many in the church (cf. Acts 10:14; 15:28-29; Gal 2:11-13; Rom 14:14). Lindeboom is probably correct in his tentative suggestion that, although there is no hint of the idea in the passage itself, Jesus, as the bringer of the new age, was free to set the ritual law aside<sup>(121)</sup>. Set against the background of his eschatology, however, it is far from improbable that Mark saw this freedom as one of the marks of the period between the appearance of the Baptist and the parousia of the Son of man. It would also correspond with the anti-Jewish polemic which precedes it and which may have been developed in a situation of growing antagonism and persecution.

Mark concludes the section with a list of those things which come from within a man and defile him. Whether<sup>or not</sup> the list goes back to Jesus<sup>(122)</sup>, it conveys Mark's view of the sins which mar the Christian character. As Houlden points out, the list of forbidden vices is given not because they 'break the rules' but because they strike at man's purity before God<sup>(123)</sup>. By contrast Matthew reduces Mark's list to six crimes (apart from 'evil thoughts') which could be legislated against. While we do not find here in Mark the rigorist ethic which has been noted elsewhere, yet this is no moralizing which can be translated into a Christian casuistry or canon law. Alongside the acceptance of all meat as clean in the new age Mark sets the demand for a new purity.

The dialogue about the loaves (8:14-21) is one of the most baffling passages in the gospel. The approach to it along literary-



critical lines has generally taken it as a Markan construction, more or less symbolical, which has been built up around an isolated authentic saying of Jesus (8:15) by the association of other sayings on the catchword principle<sup>(124)</sup>. The defects of this approach are that it does not explain the symbolism, that it makes Mark a clumsy co-ordinator of fragments, and that 'leaven' and 'bread' are hardly catchwords to each other<sup>(125)</sup>. Any explanation of the passage as a Markan construction must meet the following requirements - a suitable meaning for the statement that the disciples had only one loaf in the boat (8:14); a connection between a leaven said to be that of both the Pharisees and Herod and the rest of the pericope; a reason for the precise numbers with reference to loaves, crowds, and baskets; a connection both with the previous request for a sign (8:11) and with the disciples' personal failure to understand the first feeding miracle and their terror at the walking on the water (6:52); and the relation of the passage to the gospel as a whole.

In recent years there have been three discussions of the passage along other lines than those of purely literary-critical analysis which meet most of these requirements. Within his general thesis that Mark composed his gospel in order to instruct his own community Reploh sees the passage as one of several stressing the disciples' lack of understanding, which, however, was eventually to be overcome (see the 'not yet' of 8:17, 21). The leaven of the Pharisees and Herod is their hardening (8:11-13), the Pharisees being types of the unbelievers. The disciples' failure lies in not realizing that Jesus, the bread of life, will feed them as he fed the crowd. Thus 8:18 is a call to the community to recognize that Jesus who fed the crowd is present in its midst in the eucharistic bread<sup>(126)</sup>.

Quesnell holds that what the disciples were rebuked for not understanding is ultimately the whole later Christian understanding of the eucharistic bread - the announcement of the death and future coming of Jesus and the Christian's sharing in his saving death. He links 8:15 with the imagery of leaven in 1 Cor 5:6-8, seeing it as a warning against the failure of the Pharisees and Herodians to recognize the mystery of Christ in Jesus<sup>(127)</sup>. Both Reploh and Quesnell fail to explain the apparent stress on the numbers in vv. 19-20<sup>(128)</sup> and neither take sufficient account of the eschatological



drama which Mark expects soon to reach its climax in the parousia.

By contrast Austin Farrer takes the numbers extremely seriously, working out the symbolism according to different schemes in his two studies<sup>(129)</sup>. His explanations meet all the requirements set out above, but it is difficult to follow his attempt to explain Mark's gospel as an elaborate numerical cypher, not only because it seems inherently improbable that Mark wrote his entire gospel on this basis, but also because Farrer's scheme is so complex that even he has to admit that his first attempt at explaining the symbolism was in error. Would anyone even in Mark's own day have understood so obscure a code?<sup>(130)</sup>

In view of the complexities, all that will be attempted is to present a tentative explanation of the main features of the narrative in order to show how they may be fitted into Mark's whole scheme. Several clues help us. The first is v.18. The nearest Old Testament parallels are Jer 5:21 and Ezek 12:2, but it is closely akin to Mk 4:12 within the gospel itself, the main difference being that there it is those 'outside' who are prevented from understanding because all things are 'in parables' whereas here the words are spoken not only to, but of the disciples. Taken in conjunction with 6:52, it appears to make the feeding miracles for Mark less miracles than parables which require supernatural insight or special revelation for their interpretation<sup>(131)</sup>. The reason for the disciples' failure to understand is that their heart is hardened, which may be a further allusion to Is 6:10 (cf. Jn 12:40). Mark could hardly have thought that God had deliberately prevented the disciples from understanding the meaning of the miracles since he has previously recorded the words of Jesus, 'Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God' (4:11). Here, although there is no direct explanation of the two feedings and at the end of the incident the disciples still fail to understand, the elaborate questioning in vv.17-21 suggests that he wished to show Jesus as trying to help the disciples to 'see'.

If the two feeding miracles are 'parables' in Mark's sense of the term, he must have believed that there was a key which would reveal their meaning in the same way that the parable of the Sower was open to explanation. Hence if Jesus' questions here are intended to lead to understanding that explanation must be found in them. As the individual details of the parable of the Sower were seized upon



and given allegorical meaning, so here it may be presumed that the details which are emphasized in these questions of Jesus and the curious one word answers of the disciples supply the key to the 'parable'. This suggests that the type of symbolism which Farrer proposed should not be rejected out of hand, but whether it is possible to go much beyond the linking of twelve and the word *κοφίνας* with the Jews and seven and *σπυρίδες* with some other group, possibly Gentiles, is uncertain<sup>(132)</sup>. A strange element in the dialogue is that the emphasis is placed upon the broken pieces left over rather than upon the number of loaves used and the size of the crowds. It is hardly adequately explained as indicating that the people had more than sufficient to satisfy their needs or, on the basis of Jn 6:12, as reflecting the Jewish custom of leaving something over for those who served, or simply as the Jewish care to preserve food<sup>(133)</sup>. But it is Jesus who breaks the bread (v.19 *ἐκλάσας*; the same verb is implied by the accusative *τοὺς ἑπτά* in v.20). Is it possible that the *κλάσματα* are not the scraps which the people rather messily dropped but the portion of the pieces which Jesus broke but which were not eaten?<sup>(134)</sup> If this is so, whether or not the feedings are eucharistic<sup>(135)</sup>, the *κλάσματα* may be regarded as the bread which Jesus himself supplied, and if this is coupled with the numerical symbolism the supply is available for the Jews and for the other group. Those represented by the four thousand or the seven *σπυρίδες* are usually identified with the Gentiles<sup>(136)</sup>. The only group of seven in the New Testament for comparison is that appointed in Acts 6:1-6. 'The seven' might, therefore, point to a group of 'Greeks'. This would, however, still leave unsolved problems, for the term *ἑλληνοῦντες* is variously taken to refer to Greek speaking Jews, to Jews who have adopted Greek customs, to Jewish proselytes who had been converted to Christianity, and to Gentiles<sup>(137)</sup>. If the numbers twelve and seven are significant to Mark they might point to the gift of the eucharist to Palestinian or Hebrew speaking Jews and to Jews of the dispersion or Greek speaking Jews rather than to Jews and Gentiles.

It appears to be pressing the symbolism too far to suggest that the 'one loaf' of v.14 is a direct reference to Jesus<sup>(138)</sup>. After all, the five and the seven loaves are real bread. Unless *ἐἰ μὴ ἓνα ἄρτον* is taken as a post-Markan gloss (and its absence from



Matthew is no evidence in support of this since he has extensively rewritten the pericope and smoothed out the difficulties), it must be accepted literally in the first instance and the disciples' words in v.16 must be regarded as an exaggeration, expressing the sense that one loaf among thirteen men is as bad as having no bread at all. We might then interpret the narrative as meaning that the disciples should have remembered that Jesus had provided the eucharist for the Jews of Palestine and the Hellenistic Jews (or the Gentiles) and could now provide the eucharist for - what other group? Several possibilities spring to mind: the apostles themselves perhaps, either in their own right and possibly as those who are to be at the Last Supper, or as representatives of the universal church, the Gentiles (especially if the seven symbolise the Hellenistic Jews), or even the church itself.

Were it not for the combination with the 'leaven of Herod', the leaven of the Pharisees could well be interpreted of their refusal to accept the signs which had been given and their demand for a special 'sign from heaven' (8:11-12), or of their judaizing which is opposed in 2:18 - 3:6; 7:1-13, or of their general hardness of heart (cf. 3:5). But the Pharisees and the Herodians together have a special importance for Mark. He alone uses the word ἡρωδῆαυοι, the meaning of which is uncertain<sup>(139)</sup>. It is, therefore, a very dubious hypothesis that the Herodians are the entourage or partisans of Herod, and then to interpret the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod as the nationalistic and political ideas of these groups<sup>(140)</sup>.

Although leaven would most naturally indicate an inner disposition (cf. 1 Cor 5:6-8; Gal 5:9), it is better to see in the combination of Pharisees and Herod/Herodians a quasi-symbol for the hostility which led to the death of John the Baptist and which is to lead to the death of Jesus. This would accord with περιπατεῖς αὐτοῦ (8:11), a verb that is always found in hostile contexts in Mark (1:13; 10:2; 12:15; cf. 14:38) and is closely linked with ideas of suffering. More precisely Mark might intend a warning against the Jewish leaders in the period of the persecution and woes before the parousia (cf. 13:9). He combines this with a reference to the hardening of the disciples' hearts and the interpretation of the feeding miracles/parables. The disciples are granted the 'mystery' of the kingdom, but for the moment they are like those 'outside' who do not under-



stand. In chapter 4 the mystery is explained in terms of the interpretation of the parable of the Sower, with warnings against Satan, persecution and riches. Here the mystery is the mystery of the eucharist saved up for whatever groups the twelve and seven baskets of broken pieces symbolise and still available for the church. It is this which sustains the Christian community in the period before the parousia.

This interpretation of the passage meets all our criteria except the link with 6:52 and the reference there to the disciples' failure to understand about the loaves and to the hardening of their hearts. It may be that Mark interpreted the feeding as eucharistic and thought that the disciples should have recognized Jesus as he walked on the water.

Apart from the conversation in Gethsemane (14:32-42), there are only two pieces of teaching addressed to the disciples in the final sections of Mark's gospel. The first is attached to the story of the fig tree, usually classified as a miracle story (11:12-14, 20)<sup>(141)</sup>. The second is the story of the widow's two mites, which Bultmann describes as a biographical apophthegm and Taylor as a pronouncement story<sup>(142)</sup>. Neither fits comfortably into Reploh's or Quesnell's scheme for Mark and both dismiss them rather cursorily<sup>(143)</sup>.

The pericope about the widow (12:41-44) comes at the end of a series of controversy stories which were included by Mark to show Jesus as victorious over his opponents. The conflict theme is continued in the following two pericopae (12:35-37, 38-40), and this story may have been placed here as a further polemic against the rich<sup>(144)</sup>. As has been seen, Mark regarded riches as one of the major hindrances to the complete dedication to Jesus which was necessary for entering the kingdom. There is perhaps here also, in the statement that the widow had given all her possessions (ὅλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς ) something of that reckless disregard of the self which belongs to the rigorist ethic seen earlier in the call to the rich man and the subsequent dialogue about riches and in the sayings about denying oneself (10:17-25; 8:34-37)<sup>(145)</sup>. The phrase has sometimes been regarded as a gloss<sup>(146)</sup>. If it was added by Mark it would have been to emphasize this point. Nevertheless, the story has more the character of general moral teaching than of this



rigorist ethic.

Mark's interposition of the cleansing of the temple between the cursing of the fig tree and the disciples' observation that it had withered is taken by Burkill as evidence that he interpreted the miracle as symbolic of the fate which was to befall the Jewish nation<sup>(147)</sup>. Burkill recognizes that the intercalation in the story of Jairus' daughter (5:21-24, 35-43; 5:25-34) is to signify a lapse of time, and allows the same possibility in the account of the mission of the Twelve (6:7-13, 30; 6:14-29), although there he suggests that an additional reason was to draw attention to the popular success of the mission and the danger of opposition from high political circles, and he finds theological significance in the linking both of the visit of Jesus' relatives with the Beelzebub controversy (3:20-21, 31-35; 3:22-30) and of the scheming of the chief priests with the anointing of Jesus' head (14:1-2, 10-11; 14:3-9). But all Mark's intercalations can be satisfactorily explained as indications of the passing of time, and this is plainly what is intended here (note 'as they passed by in the morning'). What Mark does provide is a series of careful links connecting the incident in 11:12-14 with the teaching about prayer; the disciples hear the words of Jesus (v.14), they notice that the fig tree has withered during the night (v.20), Peter recalls the earlier incident (v.21), and his comment provides the occasion for the teaching in vv. 22-25. Mark thus uses the miracle as the introduction to teaching. It is not primarily a wonder story and it is certainly not interpreted symbolically. Mark accepts it as fact, and regards Jesus' words in v.14 as a curse (cf. v.21). Why he thought that the fig tree deserved its fate is not clear. If he was responsible for adding 'for it was not the season of figs' (v.13) as many have suggested<sup>(148)</sup>, he may have thought that the fig tree should have provided figs out of season for the Son of man, or else he added a pedantic note thoughtlessly, failing to observe that this made the action of Jesus irrational<sup>(149)</sup>. Certainly his moral and religious sensivity is very different from that of his modern commentators, a fact which in itself should warn against a too confident assumption that we have understood his purpose both here and in his whole gospel.

The sequence of thought provided by Mark's links may be as follows. Mark understood Jesus' words in v.14 as a curse (cf. v.21),



presumably believing that God would bring it about. Despite the almost unanimous opinion that the saying about removing mountains (v.23) is figurative<sup>(150)</sup>, it is not improbable that Mark considered that in the period of the end time in which he and his readers were living such miracles would take place. The following verse contains the unequivocal statement that those who believe that they have received their requests shall have 'all things whatsoever (they) pray and ask for'. Furthermore, we have seen reason to accept as literal and not picture language Mark's description of the parousia in chapter 13<sup>(151)</sup>. If Conzelmann is correct, Luke's perspective is very different from that of Mark, yet Acts contains a large number of miracles, including curses<sup>(152)</sup>, while the longer ending of Mark contains a promise that believers will be able to take up serpents and drink poison with impunity (16:17-18). Too great a contrast should not be drawn here between the New Testament and the apocryphal Christian writings. It is in fact the moral difficulties of the story for modern commentators that has led to their failure to observe Mark's sequence of thought. To Mark Jesus' curse is an example of that absolute faith in God which makes it possible for Christians to perform any miracle.

V.25 is one of the few sayings in Mark which is more akin to the type of teaching recorded in Matthew and Luke than to the rigorist and eschatological teaching which otherwise predominates. It is perhaps too easy to reject the verse as a first stage in the addition of sayings which was completed by the insertion of v.26, omitted by a weighty collection of witnesses and rejected by almost all commentators as derived from Mt 6:15<sup>(153)</sup>, but certain verbal peculiarities make it less than certain that the saying was part of Mark's own narrative<sup>(154)</sup>. The sole connexion with the previous verses is the verb *προσευχῆσθαι* which here is much more a catchword in the sense which is usually intended by that term than is found elsewhere in Mark's gospel. If the verse is original it shows that Mark possessed one fragment of the kind of teaching which is so common in the traditions used by Matthew and Luke and that he added it here because he felt this to be the most suitable context. It is the only passage in this gospel where forgiveness is made dependent upon a man's moral actions and where there is teaching about God's forgiveness such as applies more easily to the ongoing life of the church than to the interim between



the coming of John the Baptist and the parousia (contrast 2:1-12; 3:28-29; 4:12).

In this survey of the teaching of Jesus in Mark's gospel it has been contended that, although Jesus is frequently addressed as διδασκαλε and his activity described as διδάσκειν and διδαχη, Mark does not intend to depict him as a teacher who gives moral guidance to the crowds. The relative paucity of the teaching included may be due either to deliberate selection from the material by Mark himself or to the scarcity of such material in the tradition which came to him, but in either case it reveals a form of Christianity which was not primarily concerned with the ethical instruction so prominent in the other two synoptic gospels. Διδασκαλος is chiefly an honorific title and the activity of Jesus is essentially the presenting of obscure sayings to the crowds, παραβολαι, which require divine inspiration or special explanation to be understood.

This general impression was confirmed when the sayings addressed to the different audiences were examined. Only a very small number are addressed to the crowd and usually these are subsequently interpreted to the disciples. Those addressed to opponents are mostly found within the pronouncement stories. Although these comprise many of the statements upon which the accounts of the ethical teaching of Jesus in Mark are generally based, Mark's purpose in including them was to show Jesus as always able to vanquish any who tried to argue with him or attempted to secure his death. For Mark's message it is necessary to concentrate upon the teaching given to the disciples.

This is of two main types, eschatological and ethical. Jesus is portrayed as announcing that the end time has arrived with the preaching of John the Baptist and that it will speedily reach its climax in the parousia. The Son of man is Jesus himself and the coming of the kingdom of God is identified with the parousia. Mark holds that there is a sequence of eschatological events in three cycles, all involving suffering and vindication, the life and death of John the Baptist, the ministry, crucifixion and parousia of Jesus, and the suffering and final triumph of Christian disciples in the kingdom of God. This is one predestined eschatological event which at the time at which Mark is writing is fast moving to its conclusion.



The considerable part played by the passion of Jesus in this gospel is not due to its soteriological significance but to the place which suffering had within the eschatological scheme which Jesus proclaimed.

The rigorist ethic is in keeping with this eschatology. Mark sees the main dangers to Christian discipleship as Satan, persecution and riches. Although these dangers may be present already, they will be intensified in the period immediately before the parousia, and it is in this period that the disciples will have to follow the path which their Master trod. So imperative is the demand that they must be prepared to make extreme sacrifices. This final stage of history is also the time when there is a reversal of values, when ritual distinctions are abrogated, and when complete purity is required.

Although at several points there are teaching and editorial comments which do not entirely fit into this overall interpretation, it has been possible to include within it all the major sayings and to arrive at a consistent understanding of the whole gospel as Mark wrote it without recourse to isolating the traditions which Mark used.

This exposition has raised a number of further questions, in particular why Mark wrote his gospel at all and the date at which he wrote it. The ethical teaching of Jesus as Mark presents it is markedly different from that found in Matthew and Luke and the reasons for this need to be examined. The eschatology, especially in its emphasis upon the imminence of the parousia, has certain similarities with that held by Paul, particularly in his letters to the Thessalonians, and possible relations between the two might be traced. Throughout the discussion has been restricted to Mark's understanding of the teaching of Jesus and questions concerning the authenticity of the sayings have not been raised, since until Mark's own portrait of Jesus had been clearly seen attempts to detect which sayings could be ascribed to Jesus himself are premature. This issue, however, cannot be evaded permanently. Finally, the world view of Mark is so different from that which is generally held today that the relevance and validity of the teaching of Jesus for present day Christians might appear to be called into question. While it is impossible to treat these important issues in detail, some consideration will be given to them in the concluding chapter.



Despite the attention given to Mark's gospel in recent decades there is surprisingly little consensus of opinion as to its occasion and purpose. Bultmann suggested that the purpose was to combine the Hellenistic kerygma about the Christ, the content of which can be seen in the 'Christ-myth' of Paul (especially Phil 2:6-11), with the tradition of the story of Jesus<sup>(1)</sup>. The gospel would then represent the first stage in the process which led to the compositions of the later evangelists, who not only fill out in more detail the life and teaching of Jesus but also include references to his early life and pre-existence. Marxsen and Martin refine this purpose further as an attempt to check the gnosticizing tendency of Paul's theology which was developing among his followers<sup>(2)</sup>. This is, however, hardly what is reflected either in the overall scheme which we have claimed to detect in this gospel as taught by Jesus to the inner circle of the Twelve and declared openly after the resurrection - that the end-time has arrived with the appearance of the Baptist and will move to its predestined conclusion in the parousia, and demands rigorous discipleship amid persecution and suffering - or in the way Mark has combined a variety of traditions - miracle stories, sayings of Jesus, narratives about John the Baptist, the passion narrative - to construct the whole. The coming of Jesus cannot indeed be precisely predicted or dated, but it is certainly imminent. Nevertheless, the purpose of the gospel cannot be to call Mark's readers to Galilee to await the parousia as Marxsen would have it, for, as has often been pointed out, it is inconceivable that anyone would have written a book like this gospel in such circumstances<sup>(3)</sup>. On the other hand it is unlikely that his intention in writing was to teach the church, as Quesnell and Replloh have claimed, for a narrative, and a narrative such as he has produced, would be a curious instrument for this purpose. Doubtful also are the views that Mark used the first disciples as a foil for setting out a defence of a group which broke with the Jerusalem church over the wider mission (so Trocmé) or that the main purpose was to combat a Christology of the Θεός ἄνθρωπος type (so Weeden), or to provide apologetic for the Christian church in Rome after the end of the Jewish war (so Brandon), for such views do not take sufficient account of the fact that Mark is essentially an evangelist, and is setting out the gospel of Jesus whom he believes to be the Son of God. To a certain extent he is



proclaiming Heilsgeschichte, for he believes that he is living within the end events and the parousia is fast drawing near; the victory is not in the past but is still awaited in the future, and for the present and especially just before the End the travail of the time of testing must be endured. In this he stands in some respects close to Paul.

Different emphases appear in Paul's letters, partly occasioned by the circumstances in which they were written, partly because Paul's thought developed during the period covered by the letters. The extent to which this development can be traced is disputed, but it seems fairly plain that Paul modified his eschatological hopes, although he never gave up the idea that history would find its consummation in the return of Christ. The eschatology which Mark depicts by means of the teaching of Jesus which he includes in his gospel is nearest to that of the two letters of Paul to the Thessalonians<sup>(4)</sup>. It may be that there are more verbal similarities to be found between these letters and the apocalyptic passages in Matthew<sup>(5)</sup>, but in their conceptions, general and particular, they are closer to the eschatology of Mark.

Both look for the coming of Christ from heaven (1 Thess 1:10; 4:16) accompanied by the angels (1 Thess 3:13, as *μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ* is probably to be interpreted<sup>(6)</sup>, 2 Thess 1:7; Mk 8:38; 13:26-27); both expect Christ's followers to be caught up into heaven and to meet him there (1 Thess 4:17; 2 Thess 2:1; Mk 13:27); both speak of persecution with eschatological overtones (1 Thess 1:6; 2:14; 3:3-4, 7; 2 Thess 1:4-7; Mk 10:30; 13:9, 11-13, 19-20); both give warnings against being 'troubled' (2 Thess 2:2, *ἀπονεύθαι* elsewhere only in Mk 13:7 (Mt 24:6)<sup>(7)</sup>); both expect the coming of the parousia during the lifetime of some at least who are now living (1 Thess 4:15, 17; cf. 1:10; Mk 9:1); both utter warnings that Christ will come unexpectedly and give a command to 'watch' (1 Thess 5:1-6; Mk 13:32-37<sup>(8)</sup>); both warn against those who will deceive through signs and wonders (2 Thess 2:3, 9-11; Mk 13:5, 22); and both appear to be aimed at those who say that the messiah has already returned (2 Thess 2:2; Mk 13:6; note that the counter argument follows the same pattern - 'not yet ... until ...'<sup>(9)</sup>). Although there are differences in the sequence of eschatological events in 2 Thess 2 and Mk 13, both are concerned with the time of the parousia,



and the thought underlying both is that there will be clear indications of the coming of the End. Moreover the 'lawless one' is parallel to the 'abomination of desolation', one of the features which Best regards as support for his view that in 2 Thess Paul is giving traditional primitive Christian apocalyptic teaching<sup>(10)</sup>. Both Paul and Mark believe that the eschatological period has begun and that they and their readers are living in the last days immediately before the End (cf. 2 Thess 2:7, ἡ δὲ <sup>(11)</sup>).

It is not suggested here that the beliefs expressed in the letters to the Thessalonians and in Mark are identical even in their eschatology<sup>(12)</sup>, and there are also differences in the ethical exhortation. Mark sets out a rigorist Interimsethik, while Paul is concerned about the 'idlers' (τοὺς ἀτακτοὺς 1 Thess 5:14; cf. 2 Thess 3:6, 7, 11) who seem to have taken the call to await the parousia as seriously as Marxsen thinks Mark intended his readers to do. Nevertheless, the parousia as a motive for living the Christian life is more evident in these letters than elsewhere in Paul's writings (cf. 1 Thess 1:3-10; 2:12; 3:12-13; 5:1-11, 23; 2 Thess 1:10-12; 2:13-17, and the expectation of judgement and punishment in 1 Thess 2:14-16; 4:6; 2 Thess 1:5-10; 2:8-12). There may also be significance in the fact that one of the few pieces of direct ethical teaching both in the sayings of Jesus in Mark and in the Thessalonian correspondence concerns sexual matters (Mk 10:11-12; 1 Thess 4:1-8).

It is not our intention to resurrect the debate about Pauline influence in Mark<sup>(13)</sup>, but to plot, as far as is possible, the position of Mark within the first century. The precise form of the teaching which Paul had already given to the Thessalonians has to be inferred from the allusions to it which he makes in his letters, and the details are uncertain. It is probable that he imparted traditional eschatological ideas rather than his own personal teaching, and the imperfect ἔλεγον (2 Thess 2:5) suggests that he gave repeated apocalyptic instruction to his converts<sup>(14)</sup>. These two letters, therefore, give a rare glimpse of part of the eschatological hope which sustained the early Christians amid their troubles and persecutions, and which was accepted by Mark in a similar form<sup>(15)</sup>.

The two are similar but not identical. It must be recognized that despite the apparent precision of eschatological hopes, those who hold them have considerable uncertainty about the end events. The



sudden posing of problems may lead to the elaboration of latent ideas or the development of fresh features. Thus the questions raised by the Thessalonians or the Corinthians may well have led Paul to make more explicit details that had not hitherto been worked out. While on the one hand similarities between Paul and Mark are not to be too hastily accepted, on the other hand the differences of background and situation between the Thessalonian and Corinthian correspondence of Paul and the gospel of Mark must be taken into account in assessing their dissimilarities. All that we are concerned to show is that so far as eschatology is concerned Paul's frame of reference as shown in 1 and 2 Thessalonians (and to a lesser extent in 1 Corinthians) is close to Mark's, and that, if 2 Thess is accepted as authentic, there seems to have been a highly developed expectation among the early Christians about what was going to happen at the end of the world in which there were a number of staple features, though individual expressions of them might differ in detail. Mark attributes this eschatology to Jesus himself.

By contrast the differences between Mark in this respect and with regard to a number of other features and Matthew and Luke are striking. Some of the changes made by Matthew to his original have already been noted. By restricting διδάσκαλος chiefly to teaching contexts and limiting his use of διδάσκειν and διδάχη to more explicit teaching Matthew depicts Jesus more as a rabbi surrounded by a group of disciples<sup>(16)</sup>, as giving teaching both to them and to the crowds and as answering questions in rabbinic type dialogue. Of special significance are Matthew's removal of Mk 1:22 to follow the sermon on the mount (Mt 7:28-29),<sup>and</sup> the farewell speech of the risen Lord, where the disciples are enjoined to teach those who have been baptized as disciples 'to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you' (Mt 28:20)<sup>(17)</sup>. The Markan idea of the μυστηριον has vanished together with the thought that the parabolic teaching is deliberately enigmatic<sup>(18)</sup>, and the pronouncement stories have become a means of teaching. Jesus no longer limits his teaching to the crowds to parables but gives plain instructions as in the sermon on the mount<sup>(19)</sup>. It is in line with this understanding of the mission of Jesus that Matthew includes practically the whole of the sayings found in Mark and adds the extensive material from the traditions which he has in common with Luke and those unique to himself. It is also significant that the first action of Jesus



which Matthew reports fully is teaching<sup>(20)</sup>.

This is not the place to examine in detail the teaching of Jesus as Matthew presents it and we confine ourselves to two observations. Firstly, Matthew is concerned with teaching that is applicable to the ongoing church. Whether the sermon on the mount is presenting the conditions for entry into the kingdom<sup>(21)</sup> or the way of life which results from acceptance of the gospel<sup>(22)</sup>, Matthew sees it as setting forth the ethic which the disciple is to follow. Strenuous though that ethic may be, it constitutes a new law, possibly conceived as the working out of the love commandment<sup>(23)</sup>.

Secondly, although Matthew includes more eschatological sayings than Mark and alone of the synoptic writers uses the actual word *ἔσχατος* (Mt 24:3, 27, 37, 39), the expectation in his gospel has receded into the future. The delay of the End is seen in Mt 24:48, 'If that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord tarrieth', in Mt 25:1-13 where the error of the foolish virgins is that they did not prepare for the long delay of the bridegroom, and in Mt 25:19 where the master who entrusted his servants with the talents came 'after a long time'. It is only after the gospel has been preached to the whole world that the end comes<sup>(24)</sup>. The emphasis has shifted from the imminence of the End to the fact of judgement (Mt 13:29-30, 39-43, 49-50; 16:27), and the criteria by which men are judged are ethical (Mt 25:31-46; cf. 24:45-51). Such sayings as still express the imminent expectation remain as residual fragments of an earlier tradition (Mt 10:23; 16:28; 23:36; 24:34).

While Matthew depicts Jesus as the teacher of the Christian community, Luke is more concerned to write a life of Jesus<sup>(25)</sup>. Most redaction studies on Luke have concentrated upon his portrayal of Jesus and his eschatology<sup>(26)</sup>, yet Luke, like Matthew, incorporates a very considerable amount of teaching into his narrative. He is more ready to use the title *διδασκαλος* than Matthew and, although he includes only three of Mark's references to *διδασκειν* and *διδαχη*, he introduces *διδασκειν* on 15 other occasions<sup>(27)</sup>. Luke includes a large number of the Markan sayings, although he omits rather more than Matthew, but there is compensation for this in the inclusion of the special Lukan material as well as the traditions common with Matthew. While Matthew has weakened the distinction



between the inner circle of the apostles and the rest of the Twelve<sup>(28)</sup>, Luke blurs the difference between the Twelve and the other followers of Jesus, and presents a picture of three concentric groups, the crowds, the closer circle of disciples, and those whom Jesus chose from among the disciples as apostles (Lk 6:13)<sup>(29)</sup>. Although the predictions of the passion are made only to the Twelve (Lk 9:22, 44; 18:31-33), some of the sayings which in Mark are addressed to the disciples are now spoken to the crowd (Mk 1:38/Lk 4:43; Mk 13:1ff./Lk 21:5ff.), though Luke points out that the disciples were with the crowd in Lk 12:1 and 20:45, cf. 6:17, 20. In Luke there is more teaching directed to the crowd than even in Matthew, and some sayings which in Mark and Matthew are addressed to opponents are in Luke spoken to the crowd (Mk 3:23-26/Lk 11:14-19; Mk 8:11-12/Lk 11:29, cf. Mt 12:38-42; Mk 12:1-11/Lk 20:9-17). It is significant that Trocmé in suggesting that the setting in life of the parables was the meals to which Jesus was invited draws a considerable part of his evidence from Luke<sup>(30)</sup>. Luke's special source is particularly rich in parables of which there are fifteen, and to Luke the parables do not conceal the mystery but are primarily examples of right conduct or illustrations of God's character<sup>(31)</sup>.

Thus Matthew and Luke present a picture of the activity and teaching of Jesus which is strikingly different from that of Mark. Jesus is no longer the central figure in the final eschatological drama which is moving to its speedy climax, who addresses enigmatic words to the crowds, who is always victor in his conflicts with his enemies and who explains his teaching to the Twelve. The parousia hope is no less real, but it has moved further into the future, opening up the possibility of a period of earthly existence for the church in which an individual and social ethic is now relevant, and Jesus is, in different ways in these two later gospels, the teacher who gives guidance for this lengthening interim period. In this way Matthew and Luke are seen to be considerably further removed from Mark than Mark is from the Paul of the Thessalonian letters.

Whether this can be used as evidence for the dating of Mark's gospel and the discovery of its historical setting is uncertain. Most attempts at dating Mark have been based upon the interpretation of chapter 13, but, as the conflicting results show, it is possible to draw the opposite conclusions that Mark did not know of the



destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 or that he wrote after the end of the Jewish war. It has even been suggested that Mark's version of the apocalypse should be linked closely with the incident of Caligula and thus Mark should be dated very early<sup>(32)</sup>. The weakness of all these attempts, however, is that they are too narrowly based upon single words and phrases rather than upon the character of the gospel as a whole.

An imminent parousia hope is possible under three sets of circumstances; the occasion of its first announcement, the period after its first acceptance for so long as nothing happens to disprove it, and a time of reawakened enthusiasm when some event has been seized upon as indicating its approaching fulfilment. Caligula's attempt to place his statue in the temple and the Jewish war have been suggested as providing the third type of situation. This is certainly possible, but if correct it leads to the conclusion that Mark omitted many of the sayings of Jesus which were known to him because they no longer applied to the heightened excitement which the political actions had evoked. Its chief weakness is that of Marxsen's theory also, viz. that it is difficult to understand why anyone should set himself to write a gospel amid this kind of fevered hope<sup>(33)</sup>. If this were the background, the only credible type of theory would be of the type advanced by Pesch, that Mark added chapter 13 to an already completed gospel in order to dampen apocalyptic hopes which he regarded as false, and we have already seen reason to reject this interpretation.

Whether the theory is tenable that Mark wrote at the time when the eschatological hope was first expressed and had become current among the group of which he was a member depends upon the view which is adopted about Jesus' own eschatological expectations. If Jesus himself accepted and voiced a thorough-going eschatology, this in itself can hardly have produced Mark's gospel, for form criticism demands that some years must have elapsed between the death of Jesus and the writing of Mark to allow the traditions to develop and the types of material found in the gospels to be formed. This would place Mark within the second set of circumstances, i.e. in the period after the first announcement of the hope and before anything had happened to destroy it. On the other hand, if Glasson is correct in supposing that the entire parousia hope was the



invention of the early church, Mark might have been written at the time when the reinterpretations of the sayings of Jesus which gave rise to it were being adopted and when they were exerting a lively influence upon the beliefs of the church. Mark would then be part of the movement which resulted in the development of the expectation of an imminent second coming, and since Paul reveals a fully fledged eschatology it would be necessary to place Mark earlier than the letters to the Thessalonians.

The Thessalonian correspondence, however, shows that at about A.D. 50 there was still a very active anticipation of the end of the world which was fully accepted by Paul - he had indeed taught it to his converts as an important part of his gospel message - even though he issued a warning against the more extravagant consequences which some of those at Thessalonica were drawing from it. Here would appear to be the situation where an earlier hope was retained because nothing had occurred to disprove it. There is no hint of the disillusionment which is reflected in 2 Pet 3:4 or of the reinterpretation of the parousia hope which is found in Matthew and Luke (and in an entirely different form in John). The distortion of the expectation which Paul inveighs against is the teaching that the parousia has already happened (2 Thess 2:2)<sup>(34)</sup>. The similarities between Mark and the Thessalonian letters have already been noted. Here is a setting for Mark which could explain the type of eschatology which Mark displays and which also makes the writing of the gospel credible. The book is, indeed, as Marxsen emphasized a *εὐαγγέλιον*, a preaching of Jesus in line with Paul's missionary enterprise. As Paul found no inconsistency between working to earn his living, conducting missionary journeys, writing letters, giving advice about marriage and other ethical matters on the one hand, and holding a belief in the coming of Jesus during his own lifetime on the other, so Mark could write a gospel which sets out the eschatological events and presents the teaching of Jesus with its eschatology and its rigorist ethic. It would be a slight dimming of the imminent hope which makes this possible, but when nothing had yet arisen to call seriously into question the primary expectation.

A relatively early date and a setting within Pauline circles, though not so close to Paul as to mean that Mark is merely presenting



Paul's thought in narrative form, would seem to be the most probable conclusion to draw from the examination of Mark's gospel as a unity and especially of his presentation of the teaching of Jesus.

It is plainly impossible to proceed from this to draw firm conclusions about the teaching of Jesus himself. As has been suggested earlier, a piecemeal approach to the sayings and attempts to devise tests by which the authenticity of the sayings could be judged mark a too hasty approach to the problem, and the question of historicity can only be considered when the way in which the earliest interpreters presented Jesus' life and work has first been thoroughly examined. This has been attempted here only for Mark and any suggestions which are put forward must, therefore, be extremely tentative.

The crucial issue would seem to be this. For Mark the total understanding of the teaching of Jesus depends upon the imminent hope. Not only does he present this as an important part of the teaching of Jesus which he records, but it provides the basic condition for the ethical teaching which takes on the character of an Interimsethik. Between Mark and Matthew/Luke a major shift of perspective has taken place. Matthew and Luke still expect the parousia. Neither has rejected this hope of a literal coming of Jesus and the end of the world, but it has been moved into the future, and the extended interim now provides room for the development of the church and the presentation of a church ethic which is grounded in sayings of Jesus, some of them modified from Mark, some introduced from other traditions. Along with this different eschatology goes a modified picture of Jesus and his relations with the disciples and the crowd.

The change between Mark and the two later gospels can be explained in terms of the delay of the parousia. What remains to be explored is the connexion between Jesus and Mark's gospel. If Glasson's view of the matter is accepted, more is involved than simply the misinterpretation by the early Christians of a few sayings about the Son of man and the kingdom of God. Along with the adoption of a belief in the second coming of Jesus and an imminent end of the world goes a total perspective of the ministry of Jesus and the ethic which he proclaimed. It is doubtful whether the influence of the Old Testament is sufficient to produce this,



and it would be such a major transformation that serious questions would have to be raised as to the possibility of ever recovering the historical Jesus from a source which had so perverted his teaching, and since all our New Testament writings reveal an acquaintance with this eschatology no traditions could with confidence be called upon as evidence for a different understanding of Jesus. To get behind such a massive misunderstanding of Jesus by the earliest writers to whom we have access would be a daunting prospect and it is doubtful whether the approach by way of the fragmentation of the teaching into isolated sayings, the setting of which in the life of Jesus is irrecoverable, could be other than highly subjective.

To agree that Jesus expected the end of the world and the coming of the kingdom of God in the near future still leaves the problem of the teaching which does not present an Interimsethik in the narrower, rigorist sense. To claim that the imminent hope is the creation of the early church and that it was added to teaching of a different kind given by Jesus himself is to posit an unacceptable misunderstanding of Jesus by his disciples. To hold that Mark has presented an accurate picture of the historical Jesus in full and complete detail is to declare that Matthew and Luke, in introducing a considerable amount of rabbinic teaching, are responsible for an unauthentic reconstruction of the ministry and teaching of Jesus. Both views are too extreme to command assent. What seems more likely is that Jesus, like Paul, both held such an imminent expectation and at the same time taught about personal relationships in the world, for no-one in fact has ever been able to live for any length of time with an imminent expectation of the end of the world controlling all his actions. Only Mark, the creator of the gospel form, was able to carry through consistently a thorough-going eschatology, and even he is compelled to include teaching and incidents which fit ill with his overall plan. It is likely that he has modified some teaching in the tradition in the direction of a rigorist ethic, whereas Matthew and Luke have modified it to make it accord with the situation of the ongoing Christian community.

Rather, then, than adopting the position of complete scepticism that Jesus was misunderstood by his hearers and reporters, or



attempting to produce tests which reject either too much or too little of the teaching and may only succeed in replacing the distortions of the tradition and the evangelists by our own distortions which we find more acceptable because they accord with our own ways of thought, we must accept the fact that we know Jesus only through the gospel records. This was how Mark and Matthew and Luke (and John) understood Jesus. Each was influenced by theological perspectives. Each selected his material from the traditions. Each distorts but each also preserves true features from the tradition which he received.

What can be affirmed as beyond all reasonable doubt is that none of the evangelists, not even Luke, envisaged the long stretch of history which has elapsed since the death of Jesus, and that Mark (and probably Jesus) expected the End within the lifetime of some of his contemporaries. In this they were wrong. Few today expect the return of Jesus, and those who think that they retain the imminent hope do not, and cannot, hold it in the same form as Mark. Not even an eschatology of a parousia which is imminent but not 'delimited' can survive the sea change of 1900 years<sup>(35)</sup>, and ascriptions of the delay to the patience of God<sup>(36)</sup> or to the kingdom as having come during the life of Jesus yet not without remainder<sup>(37)</sup>, are both false to the expectations of the first century Christians and also alien to the modern understanding of the universe. The blunt fact is that it is not the timing which was wrong but the whole eschatological scheme. Any eschatology, futurist, realized, or in process of being realized, is subject to the complaint of the 'mockers' that 'all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation' (2 Pet 3:4). Neither Dodd's demythologizing Platonism nor Bultmann's demythologizing existentialism can provide any escape. The retreat into individualism with the reduction of the eschaton to the moment of death preserves the eschatology in outward appearance but the essence of the doctrine as a 'public and cosmic event'<sup>(38)</sup> has been abandoned. We must accept the fact, therefore, that the eschatology both in its Markan form and in its Matthaean and Lukan forms is no longer tenable in the modern world. To attempt to return to the thought forms of the first century is impossible since that thought is part of a total world view. It is no longer a live option to go back



to pre-scientific ways of thinking, but only to adopt an anti-scientific stance which is itself false since it is inevitably adopted along with an acceptance of those parts of the modern technological world without which existence is impossible.

To attempt to separate the ethic from the eschatology is equally hazardous, whether this is done by selecting the world accepting sayings as eternal laws of the kingdom or by distinguishing between the origins of the ethic and its validity, or by denying that the eschatology affects more than the motives for obeying the moral demands. The Interimsethik of Mark cannot be evaded, and such an ethic is transformed as soon as the pressure of the imminent hope is relaxed, as can be seen happening with Matthew and Luke. Jesus and the evangelists belonged to a culture which is alien to ours and the gap of 1900 years from one culture to another is not easily to be bridged. We cannot strip off the husk of first century Judaism and discover timeless truths since by its very nature ethics involves action within a given social structure. The teaching recorded in the gospels is in any case given in concrete terms and not as principles or ideals.

What is needed for a reconstruction of the teaching of Jesus which would be valid within the modern situation is a transmutation more far-reaching than that envisaged by Dodd or Bultmann. Nothing less than an imaginative reconstruction of the total culture of the Christian movement in the first century is required. This must then be re-presented in a modern form which is not too great a distortion of its original form. In such an undertaking, where countless individual decisions on controversial issues have to be taken, much is bound to be subjective. This is the plight of a historical religion and is part of the human condition. Nevertheless, the gospel writers who came after Mark evidently did not flinch from one form of this enterprise and subsequent Christian history has afforded other examples of the same endeavour. (39)



# NOTES

## INTRODUCTION

1. The most famous of these tests is Schmiedel's 'pillar' texts, P.W. Schmiedel, 'Gospels' (E.B. col.1381). See also W. Sanday, Outlines of the Life of Christ, Edinburgh, 1906, pp. 3-4, 106-109, idem 'Jesus Christ' (H.D.B. II, pp. 647-648).
2. D.G.A. Calvert, 'An examination of the criteria for distinguishing authentic words of Jesus' (NTS 18, 1971/2, pp. 209-219).
3. D.G.A. Calvert, art.cit., provides such an analysis. See also F.C. Grant, 'The authenticity of Jesus' sayings' (Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolph Bultmann, BZNW 21, 1954, pp.137-143, J. Jeremias, 'Characteristics of the ipsissima vox Jesu' (in The Prayers of Jesus, London, 1967, pp.108-115, idem, New Testament Theology I, London, 1971, pp. 1-37, W.O. Walker, 'The quest for the historical Jesus: a discussion of methodology' (Ang.Th.R., 51, 1969, pp.38-56, N. Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, London, 1967, esp. pp. 15-53, N.D.Hooker, 'Christology and methodology' (NTS 17, 1970/1, pp. 480-487).
4. It is often overlooked that the attitude to the life and teaching of Jesus is also 'theological', and too readily rejected that the evangelists may have had a concern to record the historical sayings of Jesus.
5. E.g. W.R. Farmer, 'The two-document hypothesis as a methodological criterion in synoptic research' (Ang.Th.R. 48, 1966, pp. 380-396, idem, The Synoptic Problem, New York and London, 1964. Although a majority of scholars still accept the existence of the document Q, the theory has been under attack from two sides. Some defend Luke's dependence on Matthew, e.g. A.M. Farrer, 'On dispensing with Q' (in Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955, pp.55-88, A.W. Argyle, 'Evidence for the view that St. Luke used St. Matthew's Gospel' (JBL 83, 1964, pp. 390-396, cf. R.T. Simpson, 'The major agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark' (NTS 12, 1965/6, pp. 273-284, E.P. Sanders, 'The argument from order and the relationship between Matthew and Luke' (NTS 15, 1968/9, pp. 249-261, idem, 'The overlaps of Mark and Q and the synoptic problem' (NTS 19, 1972/3, pp. 453-465). Others reduce Q to a number of smaller sources or see only oral tradition behind the material common to Matthew and Luke, e.g. C.K. Barrett, 'Q - a re-examination' (Exp.T. 54, 1942/3, pp.320-323), J. Jeremias, New Testament Theology I, pp. 38-39. Among recent literature see N. Turner, 'Q in recent thought' (Exp.T. 80, 1968/9, pp.324-328), O. Linton, 'The Q-problem reconsidered' (in D.E. Aune, ed., Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature, Leiden, 1972, pp.43-59), Th.R. Rosché, 'The words of Jesus and the future of the "Q" hypothesis' (JBL 79, 1960, pp. 210-220), C.E. Carlston and D. Norlin, 'Once more - statistics and Q' (H.Th.R., 64, 1971, pp.59-78), F.G. Downing, 'Towards the rehabilitation of Q' (NTS 11, 1964/5, pp.169-181), H.A. Guy, 'Did Luke use Matthew' (Exp.T. 83, 1971/2, pp.245-247)\*.
6. In this study 'Mark' normally refers to the author of the gospel but occasionally, to avoid unnecessarily awkward phrasing, it

---

\* Also G.B.Caird, 'The study of the gospels. I. Source Criticism', (Exp.T. 87, 1975/6, pp.99-104)



is used of the book. As here, the context will make this plain. The identity of 'Mark' is not discussed as it is not relevant to the study, but the tradition that Mark based his gospel upon reminiscences of Peter is rejected.

7. This seems to be the general opinion, cf. Taylor, Mark, p.87, B.H. Throckmorton, 'Did Mark know Q?' (JBL 67, 1948, pp.319-329), W.G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, London, 1966, p.55. Among those holding the opposite opinion note B.W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark: its Composition and Date, New Haven and London, 1925, esp. chaps. 12-13, Rawlinson, Mark, pp.xxxviii-xl, 43, 76, J.P. Brown, 'Mark as witness to an edited form of Q' (JBL 80, 1961, pp.29-44), S. Schulz, Die Stunde der Botschaft. Eine Einführung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten, Hamburg, 1967, p.363. M. Devisch, 'La relation entre l'évangile de Marc et le document Q' (Bibl.Ephem.Theol. Lovan. 34, 1974, pp.59-91) contains a full discussion of the theories which have been proposed to account for the relation between Mark and Q.
8. This means that it is assumed that Mark made a selection among the sayings and deliberately included only a small number of them. The alternative hypothesis would be that Mark knew that Jesus was addressed as 'Teacher' but possessed only a few parables, pronouncements stories and isolated sayings which he incorporated into his gospel, building up collections of teaching by agglutination, possibly on a catchword basis. The crucial question is whether it is credible that he should not have known such familiar teaching as the Lord's Prayer. It has to be recognized, however, that 4:2, 33-34; 12:38 do not necessarily imply that Mark did possess other teaching.
9. For discussions of the methods used in redaction criticism see R.H. Stein, 'What is Redaktionsgeschichte?' (JBL 88, 1969, pp. 45-56, idem, 'The "Redaktionsgeschichtlich" investigation of a Markan seam (Mk 1:21f.)' (ZNW 61, 1970, pp. 70-94), idem, 'The proper methodology for ascertaining a Markan redaction history' (NovT 13, 1971, pp.181-188), E. Best, The Temptation and the Passion. The Markan Soteriology, Cambridge, 1965, pp.ix-xi, N. Perrin, What is Redaction Criticism?, London, 1970, J. Rohde, Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, London, 1968), H. Simonsen, 'Zur Frage der grundlegenden Problematik in form- und redaktionsgeschichtlicher Evangelienforschung' (StTh 27, 1972, pp.1-23, Q. Quesnell, The Mind of Mark, Rome, 1969, pp. 39-57, C.J.A. Hickling, 'A problem of method in gospel research' (RelSt 10, 1974, pp.339-346), N. Perrin, 'The Christology of Mark' (Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan., 34, 1974, pp.471-485), D. Blatherwick, 'The Markan Silhouette?' (NTS 17, 1970/1, pp.184-192), E. Best, 'Mark's preservation of the tradition' (Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan., 34, 1974, pp.21-34).

In view of Perrin's rather caustic comment on E. Best's work: 'A strange book in that the author combines redaction criticism with the assumption "that Mark believes that the incidents he uses actually happened" (p.xi)' (op.cit. p.83), a comment which he would probably make about the present study, a few observations about this point may be added here.

It is fully accepted that Mark wrote his gospel with a theological purpose, and that he did not set out to present a



## INTRODUCTION

historical life of Jesus in the modern sense of 'historical'. This, however, does not mean that his gospel is simply a dogmatic work. Perrin's error lies in confusing the result of Mark's approach to the gospel narrative with his intention and in interpreting that intention in twentieth century terms. Once it is recognized that for Mark the theologically grounded 'It must have happened like that' leads to the belief that the incidents actually happened, it will be realized that there is no contradiction between accepting a redaction approach to the gospel and holding that Mark himself thought that he was recording actual events. This is true even if the extreme position is adopted that the early Christians were unable to distinguish between historical actions and sayings of Jesus of Nazareth and words and stories about him derived from Christian prophets, and that they made no attempt to do so because for them the only Jesus was the Risen Christ. It is true even if the selection and arrangement of the pericopae depend upon theological ideas about geographical and temporal terms. (It may be suggested in passing that the common assertion that the gospel writers were not concerned with history and that the early Christians made no attempt to preserve the teaching of the historical Jesus appears to be grossly exaggerated, if not in fact untrue. Paul certainly appears to be able to do so, and Perrin's arguments in Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus pp.25-30 are based upon an unproved assertion that for the early Christians the distinction between the risen Lord and the earthly Jesus did not exist and that it was therefore a matter of complete indifference which words come from the lips of Jesus during his life in Palestine.)

To put the matter in another way, the very fact that Mark chose to present his material in narrative form implies that he believed that the incidents actually happened. He may have accepted as historical episodes which were not historical in our sense. He probably adopted non-historical criteria on which to base his arrangement of the pericopae which came to him in the tradition. Perhaps he altered some of the traditional material because he felt that it did not fit his understanding of the character and message of Jesus. But what he finally produced was what he believed 'actually happened'.

It is the failure of several writers to recognize the implications of Mark's adoption of the narrative form which invalidate their conclusions. This will be seen later in the discussion of the work of Quesnell and Reploh.

10. Probably John should also be included. If the synoptic gospels are portraits of Jesus the Fourth Gospel does not differ from them in kind.



## CHAPTER I

1. E.g. J.C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, Oxford, 1909, p.12: 'It is remarkable that the word (διδάσκει) is used most often by Mark, who records so little of what was taught'. R.H. Stein, art.cit. (ZNW 61, 1970, p.92): 'The great emphasis Mark places upon Jesus as a teacher raises the question, "If Mark sought to portray Jesus as a teacher, why do we not find a great deal more of Jesus' teachings in his gospel?"'. R.P. Meye, Jesus and the Twelve (Grand Rapids, 1968, p.41): 'The Markan preference for didactic terminology, highlighted above against the backdrop of the later evangelists, raises an obvious question when it is placed alongside the incorporation by Matthew and Luke of considerable quantities of Jesus' teaching ("Q"): Which constitutes a greater emphasis upon Jesus as teacher, the repeated designation of Jesus as a teacher and as teaching, or the incorporation into a Gospel of the teaching of Jesus?' C.F. Evans notes that Mark's vocabulary shows him going out of his way to sketch the picture of a Palestinian rabbi while the teaching is limited in scope and is subordinated to the mighty works (The Beginning of the Gospel, London, 1968, p.48. Cf. B. Rigaux, The Testimony of Mark, Chicago, 1966, p.133.

Frequently the contrast with Matthew and Luke is asserted simply on the basis of the quantity of teaching which is recorded, e.g. by W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, London, 1943, p.53. R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, 1968, pp. 342-348, 356, recognizes Mark's emphasis on Jesus the teacher, yet he points to the way Matthew gives a very different impression from Mark as a 'Teaching Book'. Cf. G.D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, Oxford, 1946, p.80.

2. The data has been set out by F. Norman, Christos Didaskalos, Münster, 1966, pp. 1-23, R.P. Meye, op.cit. pp.35-60, E. Schweizer, 'Anmerkungen zur Theologie der Markus' (in Neotestamentica et Patristica, ed. W.C. van Unnik, Suppl. NovT 6, Leiden, 1962, pp. 35-39). Q. Quesnell, op.cit. p.129, gives the percentage of space devoted to the words of Jesus as about 46% in 1:9 - 8:26 and 59% in 8:27 - 10:52.
3. From Tradition to Gospel, London, 1934, p.237.
4. HST pp.347-348.
5. Mark includes 23 miracles compared with Matthew's 30 and Luke's 24. Of Bultmann's 24 Streitgespräche and Schulgespräche, 16 are from Mark, and of his 20 biographical apophthegms, 9 are from Mark (HST pp.12-39). Cf. Vincent Taylor's analysis of these and his rejection of several as genuine examples of the form in The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, London, 1945, pp.63-84. In Mark pp.78-79 he lists 19 pronouncement stories, with perhaps three others.
6. The Gospel of Thomas is no exception since its form may well have been determined by its gnostic background.
7. Art.cit. (ZNW 61, 1970), pp.92-93.
8. Op.cit. p.103. He suggests this tentatively, pointing out that we do not know how much teaching and other types of material were included in the tradition which was available to Mark, and draws



## CHAPTER I

attention to the fact that the additions by Matthew and Luke are largely teaching and contain few new pronouncement stories and miracles, which suggests to him that Mark used most of the available material about Jesus' ministry other than about his teaching, and he argues that we must not assume that Mark had unlimited material from which to select.

9. Art.cit. (ZNW 61, 1970), p.93.
10. Dibelius, op.cit. pp.236-237, R.P. Meye, op.cit. p.215.
11. Few commentators discuss the point. Cranfield seems to imply that Mark knew more parables than he chose to present (Mark, p.171), and Taylor, Mark p.493, says of 12:37b-40: 'the sayings themselves appear to be an extract or a double extract ... from a longer compilation comparable to Mt 23 (M and Q) and Lk 11:37-53 (Q)'. Rawlinson boldly asserts that Mark knew a larger collection of parables (Mark p.58, on 4:33-34, cf. p.175). K. Grayston, The Study of Mark XIII (BJRL 56, 1974, p.371) says with reference to 14:49: 'Mark had a tradition that Jesus had taught in the temple, but it is probable (as elsewhere in the gospel) that he possessed scanty information about what he said there. Therefore he did his best with what was to hand'. But this hardly explains the emphasis which Mark places upon Jesus as a teacher.
12. 'St.Mark's knowledge and use of Q' and 'The literary evolution of the gospels', in Studies in the Synoptic Problem, ed. W. Sanday, Oxford, 1911, pp. 165-183, 209-227, esp. p.219.
13. The Four Gospels, London, 1924, 1951, pp.186-191.
14. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1948, p.142.
15. See Introduction nn. 5 and 7 supra.
16. Op.cit. pp.1-23.
17. D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1956, pp.141-157.
18. Grundmann, Mark p.77, Schniewind, Mark p.119.
19. Art.cit. (ZNW 61, 1970) p.93.
20. Op.cit. pp.87, 214.
21. Ibid. pp.52-60.
22. Ibid. p.214.
23. Ibid. pp.215-217. Cf. pp.221-223, where Meye notes that, although to Mark the historical word of Jesus was final and absolute, he expected the disciple to receive further revelation through the Holy Spirit. Austin Farrer's studies in Mark may be mentioned here. He argues that the reason why Mark omitted most of the teaching was not because it was already available in written form, for Matthew and Luke did exactly this. He suggests that Mark does include a large amount of teaching ('every essential of the creed and the catechism is covered'), but he deals it out gradually and sparingly because God's revelation is not what anyone says, not even what Jesus says, but is a power active in the world. This power is a riddle



## CHAPTER I

and the teaching is the interpretation of the enigma. Farrer finds the key to the riddle in an elaborate symbolism. (St. Matthew and St. Mark, London, 1954, pp.7-11.)

24. Op.cit. p.42.
25. Ibid. pp.41, 214.
26. Ibid. p.214, 'a lesser, related problem'.
27. Two other studies deal extensively with the teaching of Jesus in Mark, Q. Quesnell, The Mind of Mark, Rome, 1969, and K.-G. Replloh, Markus - Lehrer der Gemeinde, Stuttgart, 1969. Both hold that Mark set out to teach his community through his gospel, and particularly through the teaching of Jesus which is contained in it. Neither, however, deals specifically with the problems being discussed here and these two works will be considered later.
28. Art.cit. (Suppl. NovT 6, 1962) pp.37-38. Earlier Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien, Göttingen, 1901, E.T. The Messianic Secret, London, 1971, p.79.
29. Art.cit. p.153. Cf. Schweizer, Mark, pp.85-86, and a similar existentialist interpretation in Nineham, Mark, p.133 and J.M. Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark, London, 1957, p.77. For a criticism of Schweizer see H.-D. Knigge, 'The Meaning of Mark' (Interpretation 22, 1968, pp.66-67).
30. Op.cit. pp.35-67.
31. See pp.9-11 supra.
32. Mark, pp.74-75.
33. T.L. Budesheim, 'Jesus and the disciples in conflict with Judaism' (ZNW 62, 1971, p.201).
34. E.g. was Jesus really considered to be a θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, and how widespread were ideas of θεῖος ἄνθρωπος even in the fully Greek world? See Otto Betz, 'The concept of the so-called "divine man" in Mark's Christology' (in Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature, ed. D.E. Aune, Leiden, 1972, pp.229-240).
35. Cf. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, London, 1935, pp.66-69.
36. Ibid. pp.72-86.
38. Stein, art.cit. (ZNW 61, 1970, p.91) refers to Targ Is 12:3; 1 Enoch 5:8; 48:1; 49:1-2; 91:10; 2 Bar 44:14; Sib Or III 757; 1 Macc 4:46; 14:41. See also W.D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come (JBL Monograph Series 7, 1952) pp.35-94, reprinted with little alteration in The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, Cambridge, 1964, pp.184-190.
37. R.H. Hiers, Jesus and Ethics, Philadelphia, 1968, pp.91, 110-111, cf. pp.87-90.
39. E. Lohse, ῥαββί TDNT VI, pp.961-965, Dalman, The Words of Jesus (Edinburgh, 1902, pp.324, 333-334, 340, M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, London, 1954, p.21. But cf. Taylor, Mark, p.449, Rawlinson, Mark, p.149, Schweizer, Mark, p.225, Cranfield, Mark, p.346, Lohmeyer, Mark, p.226.



## CHAPTER I

40. E.g. H. Rengstorff,  $\delta\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\omega$  (TDNT II, p.153), E. Lohse,  $\rho\alpha\beta\beta\iota$  (TDNT VI, p.262).
41. Op.cit. pp.36-37.
42. Mt 26:49 retains  $\rho\alpha\beta\beta\iota$ . Mk 11:21 is rephrased by Mt and the incident is omitted by Lk. Lk provides no speech by Judas in Gethsemane.
43. This was forcefully asserted by Bultmann, op.cit. pp.57-61, and is presented rather more cautiously by Daube, op.cit. pp.206-223, cf.141-150, and T.A. Burkill, New Light on the Earliest Gospel, Ithaca and London, 1972, p.233, but is contested by Jeremias, Theology I, p.77.
44. E. Lohse,  $\rho\alpha\beta\beta\iota$  (TDNT II, p.965), Dalman, op.cit. pp.333-334, Lohmeyer, Mark, p.2, Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus London, 1969, p.236, idem, The Prayers of Jesus, p.42, Theology I, p.77, Rengstorff,  $\delta\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\omega$  (TDNT II, p.153). The rabbi was Resh Laqish who died before 279, and the saying is recorded in Bab BM 84a.
45. Bultmann HST pp.24-25, Taylor, Mark, pp.79, 406.
46. Mark, p.2.
47. Best, op.cit. p.167, who holds that Mark sets out Jesus as a teacher (ibid. pp. 71-73, 173) says, somewhat inconsistently, that  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\varsigma$  here would be the equivalent of 'teacher' as used by Jews of Jesus, although he adds that it would have been taken in a fuller sense by Mark and his readers.
48. The address by the Pharisees and Herodians in 12:14 might appear to contradict this, but the word occurs within a pronouncement story and may have been taken over by Mark from the tradition. Mark does not use the pericope to introduce teaching, but by placing it in a sequence of conflict stories simply shows that Jesus was victorious over all his opponents (see infra pp.67-68).
49. See Table II.
50. It is not always easy to determine which verses are redactional. This is an area of analysis where circular arguments are all too common. See Introduction n.9 for works discussing the problem of redaction criticism. All the phrases which contain  $\delta\delta\alpha\chi\eta$  have been regarded as redactional by some scholars, although most doubt exists with regard to 1:22, 27. Of the fifteen passages containing  $\delta\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  only 12:14 and 14:49 are clearly derived from the tradition, although some add 1:21f.; 6:2 and 34.
51. Mark's  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$  is variously interpreted as the cleansing of the temple (Wellhausen, Mark, p.92, Lagrange, Mark, p.302, Lohmeyer, Mark, p.240, Blunt, Mark, p.228, Taylor, Mark, p.470, rather hesitantly), as the teaching and ministry of Jesus generally (Swete, Mark, p.262, Nineham, Mark, p.307), or as Jesus' activity as a baptizer (Bultmann, HST p.20, which Nineham finds attractive). The decision partly turns on whether the debate is thought to have existed as an independent unit or not.
52. Stein, art.cit. (ZNW 61, 1970, p.85), points out that the tradition depicted Jesus as teaching in the synagogue.



## CHAPTER I

53. Mk 4:2; 8:31; 9:31; 11:17; 12:35; cf. Mt 5:2; Lk 13:22. Stein, ibid. pp.77, 84, points out that Mark normally uses διδάσκειν intransitively, but this is of less significance than the relationship between the verb and the content of the teaching. It is, however, important that ἐν τῇ διδασκίᾳ αὐτοῦ and ἐδίδασκεν are introduced redundantly alongside ἐλέγεν in 4:2; 12:38; 9:31; 11:17; 12:35.
54. The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge, 1935, pp. 17-21, 320-329.
55. 'Jesus' audiences in the gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke' (NTS 10, 1963/4, pp. 139-149).
56. Audience Criticism and the Historical Jesus, Philadelphia, 1969. Jeremias made use of alleged changes of audience in his analysis of the parables (e.g. The Parables of Jesus, London, 1963, pp. 33-42).
57. 'Audience Criticism and Markan Ecclesiology' (in H. Baltensweiler and Bo Reicke, edd., Neues Testament und Geschichte, Zürich und Tübingen, 1972) pp. 79-89, cf. idem 'Jesus' Audiences according to Luke' (NovT 16, 1974, pp.81-109). Despite its title, J. Duncan M. Derrett's Jesus' Audience, London, 1973, deals only with the social, economic and intellectual background to the life and work of Jesus.
58. Baird's main thesis is that the evangelists accurately preserve the tradition of the audience (op.cit. pp.54-73), and that, because it is possible to determine the characteristic language of the sayings addressed to the different types of audience, it is possible to get back to the ipsissima verba and ipsissima mens of Jesus (ibid. pp. 171-173, cf. chaps. 7 and 8). There are two serious reasons why little help can be obtained from Baird's study. He adds together all the Markan sayings found in the three gospels, and he does not adopt adequate criteria for allocating the type of audience. Thus, because he lists 256 'Markan' logia, only 105 of which occur in Mark itself, the remainder being in the Matthaean and Lukan parallels, his later discussions cannot be applied to Mark (ibid. pp.55-56; cf. the total list of logia pp. 174-188. Actually he lists 106 logia as S1 (= Markan, whether in Matthew, Mark or Luke), but logion 87 does not occur in Mark. In addition seven logia are not listed as S1 although they are found in Mark, logia 130, 170, 176, 177, 178, 306 and 322.) Some Markan logia seem to be omitted from the list, 2:8-11; 4:40; and 8:31 as well as some short statements in narrative. He makes too easy a distinction between the Twelve and the μαθηται and divides the crowd into a larger group of followers and an opponent crowd. Further, he does not appear to have realized the immensity of the problem of deciding what type of audience the evangelists posit for any particular logion. In general Baird's bold policy appears to be to assign all the sayings in a collection to the audience specified in the introduction to that collection, regardless of whether there is any conflict between this and the audience implied by the individual sayings. Even if it were possible to carry this through, Baird occasionally falters before the evidence, and e.g. ascribes Mt 23:13, 15-36 to the Twelve + the disciple crowd + the opponents, in spite of Mt 23:1 ~~and~~



## CHAPTER I

and his ascription of the earlier verses in the chapter to the Twelve + the disciple crowd alone (*ibid.* pp. 185-186, logia 287-297, 299-301. Confidence in Baird's correct attribution of logia is somewhat shaken when ten parables are assigned to different audiences in his book from those given in an earlier article, 'A pragmatic approach to parable exegesis: some new evidence on Mark 4:11, 33-34' (JBL 76, 1957, pp. 201-207). For disagreements between redactional introduction and the following pericope see Stein, *art.cit.* (ZNW 61, 1970, p.78). Mosley also notes that both Matthew and Luke assign the Sermon on the Mount/Plain to an audience of disciples at the beginning and the crowd at the end (Mt 5:1-2 and 7:28-29; Lk 6:20 and 7:1). His study of the Lukan passages illustrates audience changes in Luke's narrative. In effect Baird harmonizes all these differences. His discussion of the four main audience groups shows that his essential criterion is a subjective assessment of the historical situation rather than the evangelists' own terminology (*op.cit.* pp.33-42, cf. Minear, *art.cit.* in Baltensweiler and Reicke, *op.cit.* p.79, who criticizes Baird for wrongly assuming that the terms 'disciples' and 'the crowd' carried the same meanings for all three synoptists).

59. 3:14; 3:16 (in  $\chi^B C^*$  and other MS traditions); 4:10; 6:7; 9:35; 10:32; 11:11; 14:10; 14:17; 14:20; 14:43. Cf. the ten 10:41. The  $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\alpha$  (3:14); 6:30 presents a difficult problem of interpretation.
60. 2:6; 2:16; 3:22; 7:1; 7:5; 9:14; 11:18; 11:27; 12:28; 12:32; 14:1; 14:43; 14:53; 15:1; 15:31. In 3:22 and 7:1 these are further specified as coming from Jerusalem. The scribe in 12:28, 32 appears to be friendly.
61. 2:16; 2:18; 2:24; 3:6; 7:1; 7:5; 8:11; 10:2; 12:13. Sadducees only 12:18. Cf. Herodians in 3:6 and 12:13.
62. 11:18; 18:27; 14:1; 14:10; 14:43, 47, 53, 54, 55, 60, 61, 63, 66; 15:1, 3, 10, 11, 31.
63. *Op.cit.* pp.97-172. The commentators differ in their interpretations. Taylor, *Mark*, p.205, says that the Twelve are prominent only for the preaching mission and during the last phase of Jesus' ministry. Elsewhere they are merged in the wider circle of 'the disciples', although it is possible that they are sometimes meant by this phrase and by 'his disciples'. But the Twelve are not identical with the 'disciples' or 'apostles', these terms representing a wider circle. He rejects the view of C.H. Turner, 'Marcan usage: Notes, critical and exegetical, on the first gospel VIII "the disciples" and "the Twelve"' (JTS 28, 1927, pp.22-30), that after Caesarea Philippi the disciples are practically identical with the Twelve. Rather by the time of Mark 'the Twelve' was an anachronism and after 6:7-13 they are merged into the general body of disciples (*Mark* pp.74-75, 230, 619). Cranfield, *Mark* p.104, says that  $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  can denote a circle wider than the Twelve, although often it seems to be used for the Twelve. Similarly Nineham, *Mark* p.116, says that the Twelve were selected from a larger number of disciples, as in Luke 6:13, but Mark does not seem to distinguish the two groups further (so Klostermann, *Mark* p.33, but cf. p.25 -



## CHAPTER I

μαθηται means nothing else than the Twelve, Johnson, Mark pp.75-76, but cf. p.61 - Mark usually means the Twelve by 'disciples' as distinct from the many who followed Jesus, and Schweizer, Mark pp.81, 128-29). Minear, Mark pp.65, 68 envisaged three circles, the Twelve, a larger band of disciples ('those who were about him', 4:10), and the largest circle of those who heard Jesus' preaching, suggesting that these corresponded in Mark's thought to the leaders, believers and listeners in the Roman situation, but later, art.cit. (in Baltensweiler and Reicke, op.cit. pp.79-89), he argued that Mark differentiated the λαος, who with the scribes and Pharisees are the hypocrites, the ἐχλος, who form a continuing audience of committed believers, corresponding to the laity in the church of Mark's day, and the μαθηται, who are the Twelve, corresponding to the later church leaders. A. Schultz, Nachfolgen und Nachahmen, München, 1962, p.47, simply notes that Mark uses μαθηται and δωδεκα promiscue. Bultmann, HST pp.67, 345, says that when Mark speaks of the μαθηται as a group he is thinking of the Twelve, even in passages before their call, although the older tradition certainly did not mean the Twelve but a changing circle of followers, as in 3:34. Reploh, op.cit. pp.27-58, discusses 1:16-20, 3:13-19 and 6:6b-13, 30, paying great attention to the Markan redactional words and phrases, and concludes that the Twelve are distinguished from a wider group of μαθηται and represent, not the twelve tribes and thus a new people of God, but the later Gemeinde, the special position of Simon, John and James indicating the hierarchical structure of that community (cf. pp. 48, 50, 56-58).

64. 2:15, 16, 23; 3:7, 9; 5:31; 6:1, 35, 45; 7:2, 17; 8:1, 4, 6, 10, 27 (bis), 33, 34; 9:28, 31; 10:23, 46; 11:1, 14; 12:43; 13:1; 14:12, 13, 32; 16:7. The Western reading in 14:4 is generally rejected.
65. In contrast to Matthew he never uses the phrase οἱ δωδεκα μαθηται. W.L. Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, Cambridge, 1953, argues that the Markan usage is due to his dependence upon a Twelve-source. He holds that the usual Markan term is 'the disciples' and that by this Mark means the Twelve and not a wider body of disciples (see esp. pp.17-31, 115-147. Despite Knox's immense erudition and his detailed analysis of the text, it may be doubted whether the many short sources which he posits ever existed.
66. This assumption cannot always be made - see 10:23, 24. Cf. 10:28, 13:1 and 3 where there may be a contrast between the μαθηται and the smaller circle of intimates. The conclusion regarding 9:31 is confused by v.35 which, although formally seeming to distinguish between the disciples and the Twelve, can hardly be intended to do so (cf. Reploh, op.cit. p.141 A. 13).
67. Three contexts are to be distinguished: (1) the historical situation in the life of Jesus as he began his ministry, (2) the situation in the pericopae, and (3) the arrangement of the pericopae in Mark's gospel. We are concerned solely with the third.
68. See Meye, op.cit. pp.145-146.



## CHAPTER I

69. Johnson, Mark pp.60-61, following Farrer, op.cit. pp.36-37, suggests that Levi as 'a thirteenth disciple' corresponds to the priestly tribe Levi.
70. Meye, op.cit. pp.140-142, concludes that Mark saw the tax-collector as one included among the Twelve, although he admits that problems remain. There are full discussions in Taylor and Cranfield.
71. The problem of consistency is exceedingly difficult in view of the fact that both Jesus and the evangelists were easterners. G.M. Carstairs, The Twice-Born, London, 1957, a study of high caste Hindus in the village of Deoli in Rajasthan, points out that they often held logically incompatible views and were not disconcerted by opposites. Whenever a particularly emphatic statement was made they often qualified it by contradicting it, yet if the contradiction were pointed out they were pained and distressed. Although Palestine is not India, we must beware of applying ways of thought which were only painfully arrived at by the Greeks as they struggled to work out grammar and logic. Engnell, Critical Essays on the Old Testament, London, 1970, p.54, inveighed against 'western desk logic' which fails to appreciate Semitic ways of thought and exaggerates obscurities and discrepancies in the text. W.L. Knox, op.cit. pp.12, 26, 37, 46, 49, 60, 79, 82, 86, 119) notes similar contradictions and inconsistencies in a variety of hellenistic writings.
72. So Taylor, Mark pp.205-206, Cranfield, Mark, p.104, Rawlinson, Mark, p.29, Nineham, Mark, p.100, Haenchen, Mark, pp.109-110, Wilson, Peake 698c, Grant, IB 7 p.673 (but a later addition to the text) Schulz, op.cit. p.66, A.14, thinks that this may be an anticipatory reference to the Twelve.
73. So Schweizer, Mark p.64, cf. Minear, art.cit., who appears to include the publicans and sinners in the ὄχλος.
74. So Swete, Mark p.41.
75. Cf. Meye, op.cit. pp.142-145.
76. So Taylor, Mark, pp.229-230, Klostermann, Mark, p.33, Lohmeyer, Mark p.74, Nineham, Mark p.116.
77. Mark p.126. It is not clear why scholars should follow Luke rather than Matthew.
78. GK 154a, n.(b).
79. So Meye, op.cit. pp.146-148, although he confuses the issue by arguing that προσκαλεσθαι does not necessarily indicate a call from within a larger group.
80. οἱ ἰδὲ μαθηταί will be considered later.
81. This conclusion is almost the same as that of Meye, but Meye's arguments are sometimes less than convincing (e.g. on 10:17-22, op.cit. pp.157-159, where he is forced to conclude that the rich man is not a μαθητής because he did not answer the call of Jesus, a call which was intended to make him a thirteenth member of the Twelve), because he is trying to argue for the correspondence of discipleship and 'twelviship' (ibid. pp.137-140, 158, 172), and



underlying this is his concern to go beyond Mark's picture to the historical facts (cf. chap. 8 'The Historicity of the Twelve'). The present aim is to examine Mark's use of the term *μαθητης*, and to study the audiences of Jesus in his gospel.

82. Op.cit. pp.33-49.
83. *οἱ πολλοί* is read by BL 13 28 69 246 and is accepted by Taylor, Mark p.299 and Cranfield, Mark p.193. Klostermann, Mark p.55 interpretes *οἱ πολλοί* as 'die bekannte Menge', or alternatively omits the article.
84. Op.cit. pp.44-46, 175 (the reference is wrongly cited as 1:4) and 188. Baird, ibid. pp.176-186, finds the disciple crowd in twelve logia: 1:25, 38, 41, 44; 2:5; 3:33-35; 7:14-15, 27, 29, 34; 8:22-26; 10:17-22, 46-52; 12:37b-40. As with passages including the opponent crowd, he does not limit his references to *ὄχλος*, *πληθος* and *λαος* passages but judges the audience by the context and by parallels in Matthew and Luke. It is therefore no surprise that he discovers that there is very great agreement between the gospel writers in their identification of the audience (ibid. pp.37-43).
85. The use of the geographical terms in Mark has been examined by Lohmeyer, Marxsen, Schreiber and others. While it seems clear, following the analysis of K.L. Schmidt, that the geographical terms largely stem from Mark himself and that no consistent account of the movements of Jesus can be reconstructed from the gospel narrative, it is by no means certain that Mark used the terms as an elaborate symbolism. Minear, art.cit. (Baltensweiler and Reicke, op.cit. pp.79-89) thinks that Mark deliberately identified the two crowds by his use of *πᾶν* but that in 14:43, 15:8, 11, 15 *ὄχλος* refers to a different group composed of puppets of the scribes and rulers.
86. *ἀκολουθεῖν* (3:7, cf. 5:24) is not a technical term for discipleship in Mark, despite its use in the stories of the call of Simon and Andrew and of Levi (1:18; 2:14; cf. 10:21), and Peter's assertion that the Twelve have left all and followed Jesus (10:28). See A. Schulz, op.cit. pp.63-67.
87. In 3:19b-20 the crowd is probably thought to surround the house, as in 1:33 and 2:1-2, although Meye, op.cit. p.150, holds that the people have so filled the house that one could not even eat.
88. It is not easy to determine the limits of a logion, and the following principles have been adopted: (1) every fresh introductory phrase marks the beginning of a new logion; (2) within longer passages a break in the sense indicates a separate logion. These two principles have been applied fairly rigorously, so that, e.g. 4:21-25 is divided into six logia, vv.21, 22, 23, 24a, 24b, 25. Every saying is included in the list, even single words in miracle stories, e.g. Ephphatha (7:34).
89. 1:25, 31, 44; 2:5, 11; 3:3, 5; 4:39; 5:8-9, 19, 30, 34, 36, 39, 41; 7:27, 29, 34; 8:23, 26; 9:16, 19, 21, 23, 25; 10:49, 51, 52; 11:14.



## CHAPTER I

90. Table III lists all the sayings in Mark with the audiences to which I have assigned them, together with the audiences according to Baird.
91. See the commentaries. Nineham, Mark p.84, says that this is a noteworthy phrase; by pointedly denying the title 'disciples' Mark shows that their attitude is not that of true disciples and they come as representatives of the worldly crowd (similarly Mally, JBC II p.26).
92. Taylor, Mark p.207 (apparently favouring omitting  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  with the Western text), Nineham, Mark p.96, Jeremias, Parables p.124, Baird, op.cit. p.177.
93. So Klostermann, Mark p.27, Taylor, Mark p.209, Cranfield, Mark p.108, Haenchen, Mark p.115. Also Rawlinson, Mark p.30, but cf. p.37, Pharisaic scribes.
94. Op.cit. p.177.
95. Klostermann, Mark p.31, says that it is impersonal.
96. HST pp.12, 52, 63.
97. Op.cit. pp.148-152.
98. Few commentators consider these details. Rawlinson, Mark p.41, and Haenchen, Mark p.142, think that the house in 3:19b and (implied) 3:31-32 was Peter's house in Capernaum, and Johnson, Mark p.88, translating  $\epsilon\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$  as 'he went home' suggests that it was the place mentioned in 2:1 (Simon's house, 1:29). Swete, Mark pp.63, 69-70, holds that the scene is the same in 3:19-20 and 31-32, observing that the  $\epsilon\chi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  is anarthrous and consists of friends among whom the apostles and the disciples form an inner circle. Cranfield, Mark p.144, makes the same point. But no stress can be laid on the absence of the article, for Mark frequently uses the indefinite  $\epsilon\chi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  at the beginning of pericopae (cf. 4:1; 5:21; 6:34; 8:1; 9:14; 10:1, 46). Taylor, Mark p.246, thinks that the saying in v.34 describes disciples and not necessarily only the Twelve and that these are possibly distinct from the rest of the crowd, which is not hostile and apparently contained many disciples. Lehmyer, Mark p.81, contrasts Mark with Matthew and thinks that the saying applies simply to those who were surrounding Jesus, not specifically the disciples. Minear, art.cit. (in Baltensweiler and Reicke, op.cit. pp.79-89) holds that it is the crowd who are identified as Jesus' mother and brothers.
99. Note Mosley's comments, art.cit. (NTS 10, 1963/4) pp.145-149.
100. Besides the commentaries see F.D. Gealy, 'The composition of Mk 4' (Exp.T. 48, 1936/7, pp.40-43), D.W. Riddle, 'Mk 4:1-34: the evolution of a gospel source' (JBL 56, 1937, pp.77-90), W. Marxsen, 'Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus' (ZThK 52, 1955, pp.255-271), G.H. Boobyer, 'The redaction of Mk 4:1-34' (NTS 8, 1961/2, pp.59-70), J. Jeremias, Parables pp.13-14, Cranfield, 'St. Mark 4:1-34' (SJT 4, 1951, pp.398-414; 5, 1952, pp.49-66), Q. Quesnell, op.cit. pp.72-88, G. Minette de Tillesse, Le Secret Messianique dans l'Évangile de Marc, Paris, 1968, pp.165-221, J. Lambrecht, 'Redaction and Theology in Mk IV' (Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. 34, 1974, pp.269-307).



## CHAPTER I

101. See Meye, op.cit. p.173 n.9. An analysis of the history of the tradition in this chapter does not assist the solution of the problem. Whether Mark inserted 4:10-32, derived from a sayings source, into a narrative found in 3:7-12 + 4:1-9, 33-34 + 4:35 - 5:43 (so Taylor, Mark p.94), or constructed the chapter from independent pieces of tradition (so Cranfield, Mark, pp. 146-148), or whether there were stages in the development of the chapter (so Jeremias, Parables p.14 n.11, followed by Haenchen, Mark p.161 A.2 and Mally, JBC II p.29), or some still more elaborate redaction (so Lambrecht, art.cit., Bibl.Ephem. Theol.Lovan. 34, 1974, pp.269-307), the result has been to produce a chapter in which at least one change of audience has been omitted. Baird, op.cit. p.180, evades the problem by assigning the whole chapter to the Twelve + the disciple crowd. Wilson, Peake 700a, and de Tillese, op.cit. pp.167, 172-173, 186, attribute vv.21-25 to the audience of vv.11-20. Reploh, op.cit. pp.60-61 follows Jeremias, but thinks that vv.13-20 were addressed to the crowd in Mark's Vorlage.
102. Johnson, Mark p.89. E. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums I, Stuttgart, 1921, pp.138-139, attributed this to the combination of a 'Twelve' source and a 'Disciples' source. Grundmann, Mark p.91, suggests that possibly οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ were those who asked the question about the meaning of the parable and received the interpretation, while the Twelve were given the general saying about parables.
103. So many, e.g. Bultmann, HST pp.67, 345, Lohmeyer, Mark p.83, A.1, Schweizer, Mark p.92, Knox, op.cit. p.38. Cf. Taylor, Mark p.254.
104. So Cranfield, Mark p.152, Grant, IB 7 p.699, T.W. Manson, op.cit. pp.75-76. Marxsen, art.cit. (ZThK 52, 1955, p.267) argues that οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ for Mark are 'die Gemeinde', and de Tillese, op.cit. pp.175-178, regards the whole expression οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ συν τοῖς δώδεκα as Markan and, comparing 2:26 and 8:34, concludes that Mark wished to include the contemporary church with the Twelve who receive the special revelation.
105. 2:26; 4:10; 8:34; 9:4; 15:27, 32.
106. οἱ συν occurs in Mk 2:26; Lk 5:9; 9:32; 24:24, 33; Acts 5:17, 21; 19:38; 22:9; 26:13; Rom 16:14, 15; Gal 1:2; 2:3 (ἐ συν).
107. Cf. Grant, IB 7 p.708, Wilson, Peake 700f., Taylor, Mark p.271, Nineham, Mark p.145, Schweizer, Mark pp.105-106, Mally, JBC II p.31.
108. Cf. Knox, op.cit. p.38.
109. Mosley, art.cit. (NTS 10, 1963/4, pp.139-149), gives this as an example of a crowd audience in Mark's tradition which he was unwilling to reject.
110. T.W. Manson, op.cit. pp.118-120, who believed that Jesus thought that the kingdom had come with Peter's confession, sees a change in his teaching after chap.8 - he speaks of entering the kingdom and restricts his speaking about the kingdom to the disciples. Mally, JBC II pp.22, 25-26, similarly sees a decisive change in the teaching after Peter's confession - before this emphasis



## CHAPTER I

is placed upon the miracles and what little teaching is recorded is mainly addressed to the crowds, but after 8:27-33 the stress is on Jesus' teaching addressed to the disciples. As Table IV shows, the matter is rather less simple than this.

111. See notes 100 and 101.
112. So Jeremias, Wilson and Mally. Taylor, Mark p.257, thinks that it is an unauthentic version of a genuine saying (so essentially also Nineham, Mark p.137 and Johnson, Mark p.90).
113. C.H. Dodd, Parables of the Kingdom, London, 1935, pp.13-14, Rawlinson, Mark pp.48, 51, Schweizer, Mark p.92. Cf. Reploh, op.cit. p.64, 'Selbst wenn es sich bei diesem Logion nicht um ein Wort Jesu handeln sollte, wie von vielen Seiten angenommen wird, so ist doch sicher, dass es keine Schöpfung des Markus und auch nicht vor Markus auf die Gleichnisse bezogen worden ist (vgl.  $\tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$  s.o.)'.
114. Bultmann, HBT p.325 n.1, Grant, IB 7 pp.699-700. Schweizer, Mark pp.93-94, contests this, arguing that Mark does not hold the idea of the 'mystery' found in such passages as 1 Cor 2:7; 4:1; Rom 16:25; Col 1:26-27; 2:2, where there is envisaged a small band who have been given a secret understanding of God's plan. Mark believes that the parables were meant for everyone. The revelation is for all, but to hear and accept it involves a divine miracle. Even an explanation will not enable the hearers to understand. Hendrikus Boers, Theology out of the Ghetto, Leiden, 1971, p.12, thinks that Mark's own view of the parables was that they needed allegorical interpretations. Lambrecht, art. cit. (Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. 34, 1974, pp. 269-307, holds that there is considerable Markan redaction in the chapter and that Mark rewrote his sources. He also thinks that although Mark held the negative idea of hardening he equally saw the ultimate purpose as total, universal manifestation, but was not fully consistent in his thought (cf. p.305). Cf. also Burkill, op.cit. pp.25-26.
115. This is set out most clearly in Boers, op.cit. pp.9-18, 107-114. Cf. M. Black, op.cit. p.155: 'Nothing is more certain than that Mark wrote and intended  $\kappa\alpha\ \dots\ \mu\eta\ \pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \dots$  that the purpose of parabolic teaching was to prevent repentance.
116. Op.cit. pp.10-14, 107. Meye, op.cit. pp.43-44, who stresses that everything happens for those outside in parables (riddles) nevertheless holds that the parables were used to promote understanding, i.e. they were 'didactic'.
117. Op.cit. p.12, cf. p.14.
118. Ibid. pp.15-16.
119. Ibid. pp.16-17.
120. E.g. Jeremias, Parables p.18, Marxsen, art.cit. (ZThK 52, 1955, pp.256-257. See esp. Ps 49:4 (Heb 5); 78:2; Ezek 17:2; Hab 2:6; Prov 1:6, and note the wide range of translations of  $\delta\psi\eta$  given by NEB. On  $\delta\psi\eta$  see F. Hauck,  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\epsilon\lambda\eta$ , TDNT V, pp.744-761. esp. 747-751. The standard discussions are O. Eissfeldt, 'Der Maschal im Alten Testament' (BZAW 24, 1913), A.H. Godbey, 'The Hebrew Mašal' (AJSL 39, 1922/3, pp.89-108), A.S. Herbert, 'The Parable (mašal) in the Old Testament' (SJT 7, 1954, pp. 180-196), A.R. Johnson,  $\delta\psi\eta$  (in Wisdom in Israel and in the



CHAPTER I

Ancient Near East, Suppl.VI III, 1955, pp.162-169), W. McKane, Proverbs, London, 1970, pp.22-33.

121. In a slightly different way, H. Chadwick, Peake 858c, points out that some of the alleged differences in the meaning of words used in Col and Eph may arise from the fact that many of the examples are 'balloon words' capable of inflation to a varied degree. Cf. F.F. Bruce's similar comment in Peake 810e.
122. See Taylor pp.55-66.
123. Marxsen, art.cit. (ZThK 52, 1955) p.264, thinks that Mark did not misunderstand παραβολη in 4:11-12 as Jeremias claimed, but that he understood it as a שִׁנְיָה here and in the rest of the chapter. Vv.21-25 are an insertion by Mark and are ד'שִׁנְיָה. But he considers that both parable and interpretation constitute the שִׁנְיָה, as in apocalyptic (ibid. p.266). Cf. Wrede, op.cit. p.57, 'the expression parabolē is entirely equivalent to "riddle" for Mark'. Schweizer, Mark p.33, denies this. Best, op.cit. pp.80-81, expresses a somewhat similar view to that put forward here. 'If we trace behind it (sc. 'parable') the Hebrew שִׁנְיָה (Aramaic שִׁנְיָה) with its meaning "riddle", and assume that Mark as well as his source understood it in this sense at 4:11, 12, then it may be possible to argue that where Mark refers editorially to the teaching of Jesus he has in mind teaching which is in riddles, difficult to understand, hard to accept.' He points out that this is true of a large number of passages including 4:1-2; 6:34b, 52; 8:14-21; 8:31 and 9:31; 10:1 followed by many sayings hard to live out even if their meaning is clear; 10:10 where the disciples need an explanation; 10:13-14, 26, where the disciples find the sayings difficult; 11:17 offends priests and scribes; 12:35 is followed by an enigmatic saying. His conclusion is: 'It may then be that where Mark makes reference to the teaching of Jesus, either using διδασκεν or λαλειν τον λογον, he is drawing our attention to the difficulty of what Jesus says and does for those who are outside the Christian community; those within are given an explanation and understand. ... The phrase "Jesus taught" is to be understood in the sense of the addition "in parables", which is itself to be understood in the sense of "riddles, hard sayings, gnomic utterances", obscure to those outside, comprehensible to those within'. Cf. G.H. Boobyer, art.cit. (NTS 8, 1961/2, pp.59-70), esp. pp.61-64.
124. Op.cit. pp.108-110.
125. Art.cit. (JBL 76, 1957, pp.201-207). This is accepted by R.E. Brown, 'The Semitic Background of the New Testament mysterion' (Biblica 39, 1958, pp.426-448, 40, 1959, pp.70-87).
126. Many hold that there is inconsistency here, e.g. de Tillesse, op.cit. pp.181-185, 194, who writes, 'Il est donc impossible que le même auteur ait écrit le v.33 et le v.34', and holds that v.34 is Mark 'correction' of v.33, but this leaves unresolved the problem why Mark should have accepted such a contradiction. Lambrecht, art.cit. (Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. 34, 1974) pp.273-277, questions whether there is such an opposition between the two verses that the same author could not have written both. His explanation differs from that offered below.



## CHAPTER I

D. Wenham, 'The Synoptic problem revisited: some new suggestions about the composition of Mk 4:1-34' (Tyndale Bulletin, 1972, pp.3-38, at pp.22-23) questions whether two contradictory views about the purpose of parables are to be found here.

127. The stress upon 'hearing' in this chapter should be noted - vv. 3, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 33.
128. Q. Quesnell, op.cit. pp.84-86 rejects the 'standard critical approach' that v.33b gives the true motive for teaching in parables. 'The most probable meaning then of vv.33-34 is a reaffirmation of vv.11-12. Jesus spoke to the crowds in parables; that is, in a mysterious way which they did not and could not understand. But the disciples (and the audience of Mark's gospel) are receiving a full explanation.' Contrast R.P. Martin, Mark, Evangelist and Theologian, Exeter, 1972, pp. 114-117, who follows Schweizer, Mark p.95, in suggesting that Mark wished to direct attention to the disciples' failure to understand even when they were given special instruction. Even the disciples cannot understand the nature of the kingdom or the divine secret of who Jesus is until Caesarea Philippi and the Transfiguration, and even this understanding is partial and perverted (10:35ff.). Jesus is not a gnostic revealer to the elect. Cf. also J.W. Pryor, 'Markan parable theology: an inquiry into Mark's principles of Redaction' (Exp.T. 83, 1971/2, pp.242-245), who suggests that Mark has combined two traditions 4:11-12 + 34 and 4:21-32, faithfully recording the words of Jesus but reinterpreting one tradition by the other to present his own view that the parables were part of the teaching of Jesus meant to be understood by those with discernment although they were not so understood during the life of Jesus.
129. This is similar to Baird's programme (art.cit., JBL 76, 1957, pp.201-207, op.cit. pp.102-109). The following criticisms, however, must be made of Baird's study. (1) As has already been noted, his identification of the audiences is unsatisfactory. (2) He adopts a curious definition of explanation of a parable which includes not merely 'semi-allegorical explanations' given separately from the parable, but also 'thematic explanation' (given by allusions in the literary or historical context of the parable so that there is no doubt about the meaning or application) and 'internal explanations' (where the meaning is so obvious that it does not need an explanation). Of these only the first can be regarded as true explanation. Thus the conclusion that twice as many parables are explained as unexplained is built into the analysis of the data. (3) Baird claims that his primary aim of showing that Jesus was more concerned to make himself understood than to veil his message and 'consciously adapted his teaching to his audience' is based upon taking seriously the statement in 4:11, 33-34 that Jesus explained the parables only to his disciples. This, however, over-simplifies the meaning of these three verses, and evades the statement in 4:12 that the parables were told deliberately to conceal the message from 'those outside'.



## CHAPTER I

130. JBC II p.37. Cf. Rawlinson, Mark p.96. Quesnell, op.cit. pp.88-103 considers this section in detail, but since his discussion includes content as well as form it will be noted later.
131. Mark p.125.
132. Despite the fact that Jesus is 'asked one question and answers another' (Victor, Catena Graec. Pat., J.A. Cramer, i p.408, quoted by G.R. Beasley-Murray, A commentary on Mark Thirteen p.30), it seems clear that Mark intended 13:5-37 to be a detailed explanation and development of 13:2.
133. Mark p.520, Lohmeyer, Mark p.280.
134. Mark p.324.
135. Cf. J.D.M. Derrett, 'Fig trees in the New Testament' (Heythrop Journal 14, 1973, pp.249-265). He notes a considerable literature.
136. Jeremias, Parables p.20, renders  $\pi\chi\rho\alpha\beta\epsilon\lambda\eta$  by 'symbol' here. J. Gnilya, Die Verstockung Israels. Is 6:9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker, München, 1961, notes that the parables addressed to the crowd are given without interpretation whereas in chap. 13 both parables are followed by such interpretations.
137. Taylor, Mark p.239, followed by Cranfield, Mark p.137. Grant, IB 7 p.691, comments on the 'looseness and vagueness of the term as Mark understands it: any analogy was a "parable"'.
138. Cranfield, Mark p.143, cf. Rawlinson, Mark p.45, Taylor, Mark p.244.
139. So Taylor, Mark pp.237-238, 240-241, Nineham, Mark pp.120-122, Haenchen, Mark pp.145-149.
140. Mark pp.145-149.
141. Mark p.138. Cf. Schweizer, Mark p.86 and Haenchen, Mark p.146, who note the unconvincing logic of the argument.
142. See Meye, op.cit. p.43, Grant, IB 7, p.836, J.W. Pryor, art.cit. (Exp.T. 83, 1971/2, p.242), who adds that 7:14 states explicitly that Jesus told the parable so that all should understand.
143. Cranfield, Mark pp.368-369, defends the original unity and authenticity of the sayings.
144. Cf. Cranfield, Mark p.364: 'indicates the manner of speaking', Rawlinson, Mark p.163, Taylor, Mark p.473, Grant IB 7 p.836.
145. So Meye, op.cit. pp.43-44.
146. Art.cit. (NTS 10, 1963/4, pp.139-149).
147. See chapter IV.
148. M. Black, op.cit. pp.16-19, Nineham, Mark pp.252-3.
149. Mark pp.259-262.
150. Cf. Klostermann, Mark pp.76-77, Taylor, Mark pp.363-368, Nineham, Mark pp.212-216.



## CHAPTER I

151. Cf. Taylor, Mark p.363. Perhaps the force of  $\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\epsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  is that the temptation was to give an open sign to those predestined to lack faith.
152. As well as the commentaries mention may be made of the works by A.M. Farrer, op.cit. and A Study in St. Mark, London, 1951. P. Carrington, The Primitive Christian Calendar. A study of the making of the Marcan gospel. Vol. I, Introduction and Text, Cambridge, 1952, idem, According to Mark. A running commentary on the oldest gospel, Cambridge, 1960, R. Butterworth, 'The composition of Mk 1-12' (Heythrop Journal 13, 1972, pp.5-26).
153. So Nineham. Others develop more elaborate outlines but most see breaks at these points. Contrast D. Blatherwick, art.cit. (NTS 17, 1970/71, pp.184-192).
154. Mark pp.78-89.
155. Die synoptischen Streitgespräche, Berlin, 1921. Cf. Knox, op.cit. pp.8-16, 150, who includes in this source 1:40 - 3:6 + possibly 8:14-15, 21 and 12:13-17.
156. Op.cit. pp.118-120, 213-215.
157. Cranfield, Mark pp.266-267, 305, 334-335.
158. Bultmann, HST p.152. Knox, op.cit. p.25, attributes the repetition to Mark's use of different sources, but this leaves open the question of what Mark intended by his completed narrative.
159. Mark, pp.436-437.
160. Blunt, Mark p.202, suggests 'perhaps better "confidently"' and Klostermann, Mark p.83, either 'ganz offen, laut' or 'freudig'. For the normal interpretation 'openly' cf. Taylor, Mark p.379, Cranfield, Mark p.279, Mally, JBC II p.41, Schweizer, Mark pp.173-174. Grundmann, Mark p.170, regards 'openly' as very difficult because the words are spoken only to the disciples. He suggests that possibly  $\pi\alpha\rho\rho\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  means 'candidly' (in Freimut), but prefers the Lat k (post tertium diem resurgere et cum fiducia sermonem loqui), partly supported by Tatian and Syr<sup>S</sup>, which read  $\lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$  for  $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota$ : the crucifixion is followed by the resurrection, and this is followed by the open proclamation of the word.
161. Eg. Wilson, Peake 704e.
162. So Grundmann, Mark p.174. Mosley uses this as evidence that the evangelists correctly preserved the audiences of the sayings (art.cit., NTS 10, 1963/4, p.140).
163. Cranfield, Mark p.281. Apparently also Klostermann, Mark p.84, Nineham, Mark p.226, Schweizer, Mark p.175. Few follow Pallis, Notes on St. Mark and St. Matthew, London, 1932, pp. 27-28, who emends  $\omicron\chi\lambda\omicron\nu$  to  $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\epsilon\nu$ .
164. Nineham, Mark p.226, Schweizer, Mark p.175, Johnson, Mark p.150, Grundmann, Mark p.174 and Knox, op.cit. p.64 make similar points. See also chapter III n.58.
165. The tantalizing incident of the first appearance of Jesus in the synagogue in 1:21-28 has not been discussed in detail. Both



CHAPTER I

Matthew and Luke found difficulty with it, Matthew omitting the pericope and transferring v.22 to form the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 7:28-29) and Luke rephrasing the words of those in the synagogue so that they refer to the command of Jesus to the unclean spirit (Lk 4:36). Although it is perhaps the strongest evidence for the view that Mark was concerned with the fact that Jesus taught rather than with what he taught, it is not certain that this is the only interpretation which can be placed upon the incident. Despite the Markan vocabulary, it is possible that vv.22 and 27, especially the latter, were derived from the tradition and thus are of slightly less importance as revealing Mark's thought. Nevertheless, Mark included the pericope in his gospel and presumably accepted it. The use of διδάχη here is curiously like Acts 13:12 where the context suggests that it was the effectiveness of Paul's curse which converted Sergius Paulus, although what Luke says is that he was 'astonished at the teaching of the Lord'. In both places διδάχη has a wider range of meaning than 'instruction'. As Lake and Cadbury note, 'διδάχη is in one sense inclusive of the miraculous element' (in F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, edd. The Beginnings of Christianity Part I. The Acts of the Apostles, vol. IV, London, 1933, p.147). It is noteworthy that NEB paraphrases both 1:27 ('a new kind of teaching') and Acts 13:12 ('deeply impressed by what he learned about the Lord'). The basic problem is whether it is possible to combine 'teaching' in the enigmatic form which is posited for other passages in Mark with the idea that this teaching was 'with authority'.



## CHAPTER II

1. See below, esp. pp. 66-67 and the discussion of the conflict stories pp. 67-72.
2. HST p.348
3. Ibid. pp.12-27.
4. The explanation in 7:18-23 applies to the 'parable' given to the crowd in vv.14-15 and not to the pronouncement in vv.6-8 or the sayings in vv.9-13.
5. Cf. the use of scriptural quotations in 2:25-26; 7:6; 10:6-8; 12:26; a rather different use of scripture in 10:19; 12:10-11, 29-31, 36; and the use of a counter-question in 2:19, 25-26; 3:4; 10:3; 11:30; 12:16. Bultmann, HST pp.41, 48, regarded this as evidence that these stories developed within the Palestinian church tradition and that their Sitz-im-Leben was the discussion on questions of law which that church had with its opponents and within its own ranks.
6. E.g. the passages discussed by Paul Ramsey, Basic Christian Ethics, London, 1953, L.H. Marshall, The Challenge of New Testament Ethics, London, 1956, J.L. Houlden, Ethics and the New Testament, Harmondsworth, 1973).
7. So Bultmann, HST pp.14-16, Taylor, Mark pp.191-192, idem, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, pp.66-68, Nineham, Mark pp.90-92, Schweizer, Mark pp.60-62, Haenchen, Mark pp.104-106, Rawlinson, Mark pp.25-26, who suggests that the episode was expanded in this way in Christian preaching.
8. So Cranfield, Mark pp.96, 100 (Mark's own comment) and Mally, JBC II, pp.26-27 ('a parenthetical comment of the Church').
9. M.D. Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark, London, 1967, pp.85-89, Dibelius, op.cit. p.43, cf. G.H. Boobyer, 'Mark 2:10a and the interpretation of the healing of the paralytic' (HTR 47, 1954, pp.115-120), R.T. Mead, 'The healing of the paralytic - a unit?' (JBL 80, 1961, pp.348-354), H.Simonsen, 'art.cit.' (StTh<sub>27</sub>, 1972, pp.1-23) at pp.4-7.
10. Cf. Taylor, op.cit. p.67.
11. Idem Mark p.192.
12. Cf. M.D. Hooker, op.cit. p.84, W.L. Knox, op.cit. p.11.
13. So Cranfield, Mark p.100.
14. I understand the command to the paralytic to stand up and take up his pallet to be the equivalent of the main clause following the final clause in v.10. To regard ἵνα δε εἰδῇτε as an imperative, while grammatically possible (J.H. Moulton, Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol.I, Prolegomena, Edinburgh, 1906, pp.178-9 discusses the construction but does not instance this passage, cf. M.D. Hooker, op.cit. p.84 and the literature cited in n.1 there), seems harsh in the context. Hooker supposes an ellipse of τοῦτο δε γέγονεν.
15. Cf. Q. Quesnell, op.cit. p.144, E. Best, op.cit. pp.95, 121-123.
16. So Nineham, Mark, pp.89, 92.



## CHAPTER II

17. Ibid. p.94.
18. Cf. G. Vermes, 'The use of bar nash/bar nasha in Jewish Aramaic' (Appendix E in M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd Edition, Oxford, 1967, pp.310-328), idem, Jesus the Jew, London, 1973, pp.160-191, where a considerable literature is cited.
19. Cf. M.D. Hooker, op.cit. pp.179-181, Schweizer, Mark p.62.
20. Cf. Bultmann, HST pp.105, 163.
21. Mt.9:13 is a quotation from Hos 6:6 which Matthew inserts again in 12:7; Luke adds 'to repentance', Lk 5:32.
22. So Nineham, Mark p.98; cf. Bultmann, HST p.18. Contrast W.L. Knox, op.cit. p.13, H. Simonsen, art.cit. (St.Th. 27, 1972, pp. 7-9.
23. Cf. Lk 7:36-50; 19:1-10; Mt 11:19/Lk 7:34. Nineham, Mark p.98 and N.Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, pp.102-108, although tending to be sceptical about what can be known of Jesus accept his friendship with tax collectors and sinners as certain.
24. I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels I, Cambridge, 1917, pp.55, 58, C.G. Montefiore, Mark p.86.
25. Mark pp.96-97, quoting Harnack as saying that these words represent 'one of the great landmarks in the history of morality and religion' (from ZThK 9, 1912, pp.1ff.). Cf. also Lohmeyer, Mark p.57.
26. Among those who hold this to be one of the main reasons for the preservation of the story within the tradition cf. Taylor, Mark p.204, Cranfield, Mark p.101, Wilson, Peake 698c.
27. So Schweizer, Mark pp.63-64, who suggests that the church added the words 'and outcasts' three times in order to show that the question was relevant to its own time.
28. Mark p.98. For the type of view which he rejects cf. Cranfield Mark p.106 and Rawlinson, Mark pp.29-30.
29. So Taylor, Mark p.207.
30. Ibid.
31. So Swete, Mark p.42, Taylor, Mark p.207, Wilson, Peake 698c. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, p.400, note the meanings 'summon' and 'invite' but list this verse under 'call (figurative)', after a series of Pauline references. So also Cranfield, Mark p.106.
32. Rawlinson, Mark p.29, Nineham, Mark p.96, Lohmeyer, Mark p.56, Mally, JBC II p.27.
33. Klostermann, Mark p.27, Johnson, Mark p.64, Grundmann, Mark p.63, Minear, Mark p.60.
34. Rejected by Klostermann, loc.cit.
35. Mark pp.65-66.
36. Although Nineham's cautions should be pondered, Mark pp.97-99.
37. So Bultmann, HST pp.18-19, 98, Dibelius, op.cit. p.65, Klostermann, Mark pp.27-28, Lohmeyer, Mark pp.59-62, Branscomb,



CHAPTER II

Mark pp.53-54, Nineham, Mark pp.102-104, Schweizer, Mark pp. 67- 69, Haenchen, Mark pp.115-118. T.A. Burkill, New Light on the Earliest Gospel, pp.39-47, argues for three stages in the development of vv.18-20. Rawlinson, Mark p.31, Taylor, Mark pp.211-212, Cranfield, Mark p.111, Mally, JBC II p.27, Wilson, Peake 698d defend the authenticity and original connection of vv.19b-20. H. Simonsen, art.cit. (StTh 27, 1972, pp.9-10) finds the closest parallel in Jn 16:20. It should be noted that the identity of the questioners is not clear in Mark. As Daube has pointed out ('Responsibilities of master and disciples in the gospels', NTS 19, 1972/3, p.4), in Matthew they are the disciples of the Baptist, in Luke the Pharisees, but in Mark they may be either the disciples of the Baptist or the Pharisees, or, as Daube himself thinks, the ordinary public 'puzzled by the absence of this practice in a circle otherwise so ardently preparing for the early advent of the final judgement'. If he is correct, this pericope is not only no longer concerned with opponents of Jesus but is less clearly a conflict story despite its form.

38. Mark pp.101-102.

39. Haenchen, Mark pp.116-117.

40. Ibid. p.115, Wellhausen, Mark p.20, Klostermann, Mark, p.28, hesitantly, Lohmeyer, Mark pp.60-61, Schweizer, Mark p.68.

41. Jeremias, Parables pp.52, 117, holds that the figure of the bridegroom for the messiah was foreign to the Old Testament and Judaism, and he has found only one late example in rabbinic literature. He therefore interprets 'while the bridegroom is with them' as being a circumlocution for 'during the wedding'. But cf. Taylor, Mark pp.201-202, Cranfield, Mark pp.109-110, O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, London, 1963, pp.61-62, who hold that Jesus derived the metaphor from the Old Testament where it is used of God himself, thus indicating his awareness of his divinity.

42. Cf. Jn 3:29; 2 Cor 11:2; Eph 5:32; Apoc 19:7; 21:2.

43. Cf. Taylor, Mark pp.211-212.

44. 'Die Fastenfrage (Mk 2:18-22)' (ThStund Krit. 108, 1937/8, pp. 387ff.) discussed in W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, London, 1961, pp.75-76.

45. Although 'in that day' and 'in those days' do not have a technical sense in Mark (1:9; 4:35; 8:1), it is not without significance that these phrases occur three times in chap. 13 (vv. 17, 19, 24, cf. 20 and 32). Karl Th. Schäfer, '... und dann werden sie fasten, an jenem Tage' (in Synoptische Studien Alfred Wikenhauser dargebracht, München, 1953, pp.124-147) proposes a similar interpretation to that set out here.

46. This is the only reference to fasting in Mark (most omit καὶ νηστεύειν in 9:29 with  $\times B k$  geo<sup>1</sup> ClemAlex).

47. Cf. Swete, Mark p.45, Lagrange, Mark pp.49-51.

48. Mark p.113.

49. Jeremias, Parables pp.117-118, followed by Mally, JBC II p.27, suggests that the garment is a symbol of the universe which



CHAPTER II

Jesus will not patch up but will create anew, and the new wine represents the time of salvation. Thus both sayings declare that the old is past and 'the New Age has been ushered in'. So essentially Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus pp.81-82.

50. Mark p.104, cf. Grant, IB 7, pp.676-677. By contrast B. Lindars, The Gospel of John, London, 1972, p.125, sees a parallel to these ideas in the miracle at Cana and says that the emphasis in both stories is placed on the inadequacy of the old dispensation.
51. So Klostermann, Mark p.28. Montefiore, Mark p.89<sup>89</sup> comments on the 'advanced radicalism' of these verses.
52. Although most commentators note the fresh introduction in v.27a, their answers to the question of the original unity of the pericope are usually based upon theories about the authenticity of the sayings in vv.25-26, 27 and 28, and interpretations of the logical connexions between them. The question is complicated by the failure of Matthew and Luke to contain an equivalent to v.27 and the omission of this verse by certain authorities for the Western text, but most accept it as Markan (so emphatically Bultmann, HST p.16, although Branscomb, Mark p.58 and Nineham, Mark p.107, reject it.
53. Taylor, Mark p.219.
54. D a c e f f i; cf. Mally, JBC II pp.27-28.
55. Mark p.219.
56. Ibid. p.220.
57. As Haenchen points out, it was no special practice of the early Christians to walk through cornfields on the Sabbath, eating the ears of corn!
58. Taylor, Mark p.214.
59. Ibid. p.220: 'on its way to become a Pronouncement-story'.
60. Bultmann, HST p.12, Taylor, Mark pp.220-222.
61. So Swete, Mark p.52, Rawlinson, Mark p.36, Wilson, Peake 698f.
62. Klostermann, Mark p.32, Cranfield, Mark p.120, Schweizer, Mark p.75.
63. Mark pp.133-134. Cf. Mally, JBC II p.28: 'Jesus' words silence his adversaries more by their irony than their cogency'.
64. Mark pp.68-69.
65. Mark pp.109-110, quoting Manson, Sayings of Jesus p.190.
66. Best, op.cit. pp.39-40, however, argues that in these pericopae Jesus 'is concerned, not to show them (the opponents) up in the eyes of bystanders, but to lead them to a fuller comprehension of the ways of God with men. He puts forward a genuine argument in which he attempts to win them over to his own position'. The same is true of 7:1ff. and 10:2ff. 12:13-40 might seem to be more abrupt with the opponents but (1) these four incidents form a stylized pattern based in part on questions asked in the Passover Haggadah (so Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1956, pp.158ff.), (2) the form of such a pericope as 12:13-17 where Jesus seems to silence the Pharisees with a clever retort lies in the nature of what is happening:



## CHAPTER II

'stories told of great men always show them silencing their opponents with astute answers', (3) in 12:13-40 Jesus' sharper tone may be accounted for by the fact that his opponents with the exception of the scribe in v.28 are out to trap him in order to have an accusation against him rather than genuinely seeking information. This interpretation confuses Mark's intention with historical events. Also the first point seems to be inconsistent with the other two arguments.

67. Bultmann, HST p.20, Klostermann, Mark p.119, Nineham, Mark pp. 306-308.
68. Taylor, Mark pp.468-369, Cranfield, Mark p.362.
69. Taylor, Mark p.470, says that Jesus' question 'implies that John's ~~ἐξουσία~~ came from God, and, more important still, a veiled claim that Jesus Himself is the Messiah'. F.W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus, London, 1962, p.207, disputes this: 'Jesus is making the same claim for himself as he makes for John - his authority comes from God, nothing more'.
70. E.g. Lindsay Dewar, Outline of New Testament Ethics, London, 1949, p.81, L.H. Marshall, op.cit. pp.150-152, W. Lillie, Studies in New Testament Ethics, Edinburgh, 1961, p.91, F.R. Barry, Christian Ethics and Secular Society, London, 1966, pp.222-223.
71. E.g. Nineham, Mark p.314, Rawlinson, Mark p.165, Wilson, Peake 708b, Mally, JBC II p.48, Taylor, Mark pp.477-478. It is of central importance for Brandon's view of Mark, cf. Jesus and the Zealots, Manchester, 1967, pp.224, 270-271, 345-349.
72. Op.cit. p.82.
73. HST p.26. Nineham, Mark p.317, holds that it comes from Mark.
74. Minear, Mark pp.112-113.
75. Lohmeyer, Mark p.253. Somewhat similar is Cranfield, Mark pp.371-372, who repeats the frequently cited view that the ancients believed that a ruler's coins actually belonged to him, against which see J.D.M. Derrett, Law in the New Testament, London, 1970, p.321.
76. Branscomb, Mark pp.213-215. Cf. I. Abrahams, op.cit. Vol.I, pp.62-65, H. Braun, Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus II, Tübingen, 1957, p.83, A.2.
77. Wilson, Peake 708c. Mally, JBC II p.48, accepts this as the interpretation given to the words in the time of Mark. Taylor, Mark, p.480, holds that the teaching in Rom 13:7 and 1 Pet 2:13-14 is 'in close agreement with the teaching of Jesus. Cf. Derrett, op.cit. pp.335-337.
78. Mally, loc.cit., Nineham, Mark, pp.315-316 (but treasured in the Rome of Mark's day in a Pauline sense), Schniewind, Mark pp.121-123. So in a slightly different sense J.N. Robinson, op.cit. p.48. Cf. S. Schulz, op.cit. p.149.
79. Schweizer, Mark p.244, Houlden, op.cit. p.44 (the words of Jesus are 'an impatient brushing aside of the Pharisees' question, then a thunderous assertion of God's rights, which are total. Only this sense is consistent with Jesus' central and insistent



## CHAPTER II

message: that God rules'. Houlden adds that this was probably how Mark understood the saying also.) L.Goppelt, 'The Freedom to pay the imperial tax (Mk 12:17)' (Studia Evangelica II, 1964, pp.183-194 = 'Die Freiheit zur Kaisersteuer' in Ecclesia und Res Publica, ed. G. Krättschmer and B. Lohse, Göttingen, 1961, pp.41-50) adopts this view in a slightly modified form - Jesus knowingly sidesteps the argument, since the believer participates in salvation and this relativizes both the paying of taxes and election and the law, and gives a new freedom to follow God's claim. Thus Jesus' words are fully in accord with Rom 13. Note also S.G.F. Brandon, op.cit. pp.345-349, and his other writings on this theme, The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth, London, 1968, pp.67, 144-146, 'The date of the Markan gospel' (NTS 7, 1960/1, pp.126-141), 'Jesus and the Zealots: Aftermath' (BJRL 54, 1971, pp.47-66), who holds that Jesus' original saying was an unambiguous demand to refuse to pay taxes but that Mark worked this into a pericope which was pro-Roman, a view which he set out first in 'The apologetic factor in Mark' (Studia Evangelica II, 1964, pp.41-42). K. Grayston, art.cit. (BJRL 56, 1974, p.372) thinks that in Mark's version the emphasis lies on the rendering to God what is his and that the saying must mean that the Jerusalem establishment and the temple are not what God requires.

80. Cf. Q. Quesnell, op.cit. p.137 - '12:17 implies a moral principle but its aspect as a good answer to Christ's adversaries is perhaps predominant'.
81. Beside the commentaries see E.E. Ellis, 'Jesus, the Sadducees and Qumran' (NTS 10, 1963/4, pp.274-279).
82. Rawlinson, Mark p.168, Nineham, Mark p.321, Mally, JBC II p.49; Schweizer, Mark pp.245-246, sees the basis of the story in the need which pressed upon early Christianity to defend its faith against the dogmatic confidence of the Pharisees and the scepticism of the Sadducees.
83. See W.L. Knox, op.cit. pp. 10, 85-91.
84. Cf. Nineham, Mark p.318: 'He may have got this last story from some other source and deliberately place it after the last story because he wanted to exhibit Our Lord as being 'put to the test' (v.15) by - and successfully maintaining his orthodoxy against - the Sadducaic, as well as the Pharisaic, wing of contemporary Judaism'. This is too intellectual and J.M. Robinson is more correct when he sees the debates with opponents as akin to the conflicts with the demons in the exorcisms (op.cit. pp.43-53), though cf. Best, op.cit. pp.19-22. K. Grayston, art.cit. (BJRL 56, 1974, p.372), who sees the whole of chaps. 11-12 as showing Mark's hostility to the temple and the priests, suggests that he may have included the pericope about the resurrection to show Christians what sort of arguments the Sadducees would stoop to and what reply Jesus would give; that God was not God of the dead temple regime but of the living tradition of the fathers of Israel. This rightly recognizes the conflict theme in the section but treats it too narrowly.
85. Mark p.322, cf. Bultmann, HST p.26.
86. Although T.A. Burkill, op.cit. p.58, thinks that the scribe poses



## CHAPTER II

- his question after seeing that Jesus can deal competently with enquiries. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, p.402, list this verse under *καλως* 4b, 'rightly, well', but more probably the sense is 1, 'fitly, splendidly' (cf. 7:37).
87. The main agreements are: *νομικος*, *διδασκαλε*, *(ἐκ)πειρασων*, the omission of Mk 12:29b (and 12:32-34 which is partly placed elsewhere). MSS differ on the preposition used with the first commandment in its Lukan form, but D λ Lat Sah have *ἐν* throughout as Matthew (λB have *ἐξ ἑλης της καρδιας* and then *ἐν*).
  88. T.W. Manson, Sayings of Jesus, London, 1949, pp.259-260. So also Cranfield, Mark p.376 and Jeremias, Parables p.202.
  89. See Taylor, Mark pp.484-485, Branscomb, Mark pp.219-220, Bultmann, HST p.22.
  90. V.P. Furnish, The Love Commandment in the New Testament, London, 1973 (Nashville and N.Y., 1972), pp.30-45, 59-60.
  91. Ibid. pp.25-30, cf. G. Bornkamm, 'Das Doppelgebot der Liebe' (in Geschichte und Glaube, Erster Teil, Gesammelte Aufsätze III, München, 1968, pp.37-45).
  92. Furnish, op.cit. p.29.
  93. Letter of Aristeeas, 234 (R.H. Charles, Apoc. and Pseud. II, p.115).
  94. Op.cit. p.30, cf. p.59. Lohmeyer, Mark p.258, and Taylor, Mark p.486, stress the link between monotheism and morality, but Nineham, Mark p.326, warns against reading too much into the words of the text.
  95. So Taylor, Mark p.490, and Nineham, Mark p.328. Daube, op.cit. pp.158-169, maintains that the section from v.13 to v.37 is a unity and corresponds to a four-fold rabbinic pattern of question and answer. This may have been true of Mark's source, but there is no reason to think that Mark intended the four questions to be linked in this way.
  96. Nineham, Mark p.323, however, thinks that the lack of hostility shows that the story did not form part of the collection of controversy stories and that vv. 28a and 34b, which are Markan constructions, were designed to adapt the story to its present position. He suggests that Mark placed it here to emphasize the essential orthodoxy of Jesus and his faithfulness to the Law. W.L. Knox, op.cit. pp.86-87 and T.A. Burkill, op.cit. p.58 also think that Mk 12:28-34 is less anti-Pharisaic than Mt 22:34-40.
  97. Q. Quesnell, op.cit. p.137, makes a similar point: '12:29-31 certainly contains universal moral teaching. In context, however, the emphasis here too is probably on the controversy: the general context of the chapter is the rejection of Israel'. J.L. Houlden, op.cit. pp.44-45, adds the further point that although moral rules are given in this pericope, the result of even perceiving them is to be 'not far from the kingdom of God'. Thus 'they are less rules for moral guidance than keys to the realization of God's rule'. This is rather too succinctly stated, but unless the kingdom of God is given a different sense from that elsewhere in Mark the judgement is substantially correct in seeing this final reply of Jesus as a major pointer to the significance which the episode had for Mark.



CHAPTER II

98. Cf. supra p.33.
99. So Lohmeyer, Mark pp.76-77, Schmid, Mark p.80, Branscomb, Mark pp.67-68, Cranfield, Mark pp.133-134, Nineham, Mark p.123, Mally, JBC II p.29. Bultmann, HST pp.29-30, sees the original tradition in vv.21 and 35, for which vv.31-34 are 'an imaginary situation' and which have been separated by vv.22-30.
100. Mark pp.135-139.
101. So Bultmann, HST pp.13-14, Klostermann, Mark p.37, Branscomb, Mark pp.70-74, Taylor, Mark pp.237-244, Nineham, Mark p.120, Shcweizer, Mark pp.83-84, Schmid, Mark, pp.81-84, Haenchen, Mark pp.145-149.
102. To accept this does not involve accepting the theory that Jesus fought and defeated the devil in the temptation (binding the strong man) and now is continuing the struggle (J.M. Robinson, op.cit. pp.28-32, cf. the discussion of Robinson and Best infra pp. 115-118). Nineham, Mark p.121 looks favourable upon Robinson's theory.
103. Most commentators see no problem here beyond suggesting that the plural 'in parables' refers to the three sayings in vv.24-29 or is used adverbially.
104. Thus Baird classifies the saying as type A0 - addressed to hard core opponents.
105. Op.cit. pp.63-64.
106. HST pp.29-30.
107. Mark p.245. Also Cranfield, Mark p.143.
108. Mark p.75. Grant, IB 7 p.694 sees the saying as a word of comfort to Christians who had been ostracized and persecuted.
109. Schmid, Mark p.85, Mally, JBC II p.29.
110. Mark pp.87-88.
111. The main divisions are vv.1-8, 9-13, 14-15, 17-19, 20-23, marked off by changes of audience and fresh introductions (cf. Bultmann, HST pp.17-18, Taylor, Mark pp.334, 339, 342-343, Nineham, Mark pp.188-193, Haenchen, Mark pp.261-268, Grundmann, Mark pp.145-146. Most regard 'that is to say, Given' (v.11) and 'making all meats clean' (v.19) as editorial, although Johnson, Mark p.131, on the basis of codex 2427 which omits vv.3-4 (cf. Mt15 and Lk 11) and the alleged historical fact that 'all the Jews' would have been incorrect in Jesus' time and even when Mark wrote, suggests that this phrase, and perhaps the whole parenthesis is a later interpolation. Rawlinson, Mark p.93, finds the nucleus in vv. 1, 2, 5, and 15, to which Mark added vv.3-4, 6-7, 8, 9-13, 17-19 and 20-23. Schweizer has a complicated theory of composition (Mark pp.145-147), while Cranfield, Mark pp.230, 239, 242-245, accepts the whole section as a single unit apart from editorial comments in vv.3-4, 11b and 19b, but his arguments show no more than that Mark treated it as such, as he admits. W.L. Knox, op.cit. pp.52-53, attributes the compilation to a hellenist, apart from the introduction of the crowd in v.14 and the return to the house in v.17 which may have been added by Mark to make the chapter match the tract on parables in chap. 4. Q. Quesnell, op.cit. pp.88-103, is almost alone in attempting to discover



## CHAPTER II

Mark's intention in compiling the section.

112. Cf. supra pp.41-42, 46.
113. Cf. Taylor, Mark p.343, Nineham, Mark p.192.
114. Cf. the discussion in Taylor, Mark pp.338-339, Nineham, Mark pp.193-194, Lohmeyer, Mark pp.138-140. The Qumran literature provides examples of such washings, but it still appears to be true that Mark exaggerates when he says that 'all the Jews' observe these ritual cleansings so rigorously. The basic discussions are A. Büchler, 'The law of purification in Mark 7:1-23' (Exp.T. 21, 1909/10, pp.34-40), G. Margoliouth, 'The Traditions of the Elders' (St. Mark 7:1-23)' (Exp.T. 22, 1910/11, pp.261-263).
115. E.g. Lk 11:37-52, Acts 28:25-28, Rom 11:8. Cf. Q. Quesnell, op.cit.95-97.
116. There is doubt about the precise nature of the action. Rawlinson, Mark pp.95-96 offers four alternative interpretations, while Fitzmyer, followed by Mally, uses a recently discovered ossuary to interpret the saying (Joseph A. Fitzmyer, 'The Aramaic Qorban inscription from Jebel Hallet Et-Tûri and Mark 7:11/Matt 15:5' (JBL 78, 1959, pp.60-65, Mally, JBC II pp.36-37). Earlier discussions are to be found in Taylor, Mark pp.341-342, Montefiore, Mark pp.164-166, J.H.A. Hart, 'Corban' (JQR 19, pp.615-650), K.H. Rengstorff, καρβαν (TDNT III, pp.860-866).
117. Did. 8:1-2. It may be noted that Matthew has increased the anti-Pharisaic polemic with the addition of Mt 15:12-14, but has more markedly heightened the didactic stress of the incident by reversing the order of the Isaiah quotation and the saying about Corban, by restricting the list of vices in 15:19 to legal offences, and by reiterating in 15:20 'but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not the man'. Q. Quesnell, op.cit. p.28 concludes that the whole passage 'seems very clearly to belong with the controversies of 2:1 - 3:6' not only in form but also in matter, but this may not be true of vv.14-23. Houlden, op.cit. pp.50-51, however, thinks that, while both Matthew and Mark regard the passage as bearing an ethical message. Matthew is mainly concerned with condemning the obvious abuse of Corban, whereas Mark emphasizes that what matters is the heart.
118. Cf. Nineham, Mark, pp.259-260. W.L. Knox, op.cit. pp.68-69, regards vv.2-10 as an independent pericope on the Christian law of marriage to which Mark has added the later ecclesiastical formulation in vv.11-12 and then used it to fill in the journey to Jerusalem.
119. R.H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, Oxford, 1950), p.114.
120. Mark pp.201-202. K.-G. Replöh, op.cit. pp.173-185, regards 10:2-31 as a collection of teaching compiled by Mark, dealing with problems of concern to his Gemeinde.
121. προερχομεν φαρισαιοι is omitted by D a b k syr<sup>s</sup>. Taylor, Mark p.417, Rawlinson, Mark p.134, Cranfield, Mark p.318 ('perhaps rightly'), Nineham, Mark pp.259, 264, accept this. The textual evidence is not strong and the decision to omit the words is



## CHAPTER II

really made on the grounds that the tendency is to add such specific references and from a desire to return to the 'historical incident', although these presuppositions are not usually made explicit. It is doubtful if Mark would have described anonymous questioners as 'tempting' Jesus.

122. Op.cit. p.45. E. Best, op.cit. pp.30-33, denies that  $\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  in 10:2 and 12:15 means 'testing someone as to his opinion', although he thinks that we cannot exclude the meaning of 'tempt' in either passage and should retain it in 8:11. But these temptations came from men, not from Satan and demonic powers. Rather weakly he argues, 'It should also be noted that on any occasion when Jesus is asked a question which involves him in a statement about his ministry or concerning how men should behave there is the temptation not to speak the truth but to say what men would like to hear', and he treats 10:2 and 12:15 simply as catch questions.
123. Cf. J.L. Houlden, op.cit. pp.77-79, Jeremias, Theology I, p.225, the latter regarding 10:11-12 as a stage in the development of legal regulations.
124. Note should be taken of the view of C.F. Evans, op.cit. pp.54-55, that the form of the teaching in Mark is important. He points out that 'to a considerable extent the teaching of Jesus in Mark's gospel means not a sequence, and still less a system, but a succession of single authoritative sentences, each bringing to an end a dispute over some issue raised by opponents with hostile intent', and contrasts this with the view of Jesus the Teacher in Matthew, Luke and the Gospel of Thomas. Partially accepting the view of J.M. Robinson, he adds, 'such a series of controversies, so stripped down as to show Jesus always and inevitably emerging as victor with the last word, was more congruous than any other type of teaching with Mark's story, which is primarily one of power through mighty works'. This may be accepted as emphasizing the Markan stress on Jesus the victor over his opponents, but the extent to which Mark intended the 'single authoritative sentences' as 'teaching' is doubtful.
125. So Bultmann, HST pp.21-22. Taylor, Mark pp.424-425, says that it is classified better as a story about Jesus which at the time when Mark wrote had not yet gained the rounded form of a pronouncement story, and he points to the 'fuller knowledge of the incident' than would have been supplied by a true pronouncement story which Mark possessed.
126. But Cranfield, Mark p.329, regards this as not a feeling of attraction but a love which goes out in help and self-giving.
127. But contrast Taylor, Mark pp.424-425.
128. 'St. Matthew's Gospel in recent study' (Exp.T. 80, 1968/9, pp.132-136, at p.133).
129. Although K.-G. Reploh's central thesis about the purpose of Mark is to be rejected, he has pointed to one important feature of Mark's use of these pronouncement stories. In 7:1-23 and 10:1-45 there may be a greater emphasis upon the teaching than in 2:1 - 3:6 and 11:27-12:40. Even here, however, it is still true that Mark's purpose is not to give teaching for the continuing life of his Gemeinde but to present the rigorist ethic for the interim.



## CHAPTER III

1. Many studies of these verses aim to get back to the authentic words of Jesus. This question is not relevant to our purpose.
2. Mark p.138.
3. Mark p.41.
4. Parables p.16 and Theology I p.120.
5. Mark p.92.
6. JBC II p.30.
7. Other similar interpretations are to be found in Taylor, Mark p.255, G. Barth, art.cit. (in Bornkamm, Barth and Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, p.107), G.E. Ladd, Jesus and the Kingdom, London, 1966, pp.214, 218, R.N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, London, 1943, pp.64-65.
8. Op.cit. p.60, cf. pp.56-66.
9. Mark p.153. Cranfield identifies Jesus with the kingdom, cf. p.68, 'The kingdom of God has come close to men in the person of Jesus, and in his person it actually confronts them'.
10. Art.cit. (ZThK 52, 1955, p.268).
11. Op.cit. pp.24-25.
12. Other similar interpretations in B. Rigaux, The Testimony of St. Mark, Chicago, 1966, p.89, Schmid, Mark p.95, G. Bornkamm, μυστηριον, TDNT IV, pp.818-819, S. Schulz, op.cit. p.150.
13. Op.cit. pp.200-201.
14. Op.cit. pp.65-67, cf. p.181.
15. Op.cit. pp.65-66.
16. Op.cit. pp.72-81. While we may be unable to agree that Mark built his whole gospel upon the theme of the disciples' failure to understand the bread symbolism, it is manifestly unjust to dismiss Quesnell's most thorough study of Mark in a footnote as R.P. Martin does (op.cit. p.117 n.30).
17. G. Bornkamm, 'End expectation and church in Matthew' (in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H.J. Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, London, 1963, p.19).
18. G. Barth, 'Matthew's understanding of the Law' (in Bornkamm, Barth and Held, op.cit. p.107).
19. For discussion and literature see G. Bornkamm, μυστηριον, TDNT IV, pp.802-827, Cranfield, art.cit. (SJT 5, 1952, pp.51-55), idem, Mark pp.152-153, C.F.D. Moule, Colossians, Cambridge, 1957, pp.80-83, de Tillesse, op.cit. pp.194-201. Few studies examine the kingdom sayings in Mark in isolation from the meaning of the kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus generally or attempt to show the place which the concept has within Mark's total view of God's action in the present and the future. It has been argued in the Introduction that scholars have attempted to move too quickly to the thought of Jesus himself and have adopted a mistaken, piecemeal approach to the sayings found in the gospels (supra pp.5-6). This is a legacy from the early days of form criticism which must be abandoned now that the part played by



## CHAPTER III

the evangelists as creative theologians has been recognized. It is of particular importance when the teaching on the kingdom of God is being considered, because the entire message of the early Christians and of Jesus himself is conditioned by their eschatological expectations. Later it will be shown that Mark had a very clear picture of the end events. It is likely, therefore, that he had a clear understanding of the concept of the kingdom of God and to this we now turn. Cf. E. Best, op.cit. pp.64-68.

20. Cf. Rawlinson, Mark pp.51-52, Branscomb, Mark pp.78-79, Nineham, Mark p.138, and contrast Cranfield art.cit. (SJT 5, 1952, pp.51-55), idem, Mark pp.152-153. Grundmann, Mark p.92, also rejects the allusion to hellenistic mysteries, referring to E. Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien, Lund, 1955, pp.165-170.
21. Dodd interpreted the first two in a present sense, and referred to the third as 'the transcendent order beyond space and time' (op.cit. pp.44-45, 53-54, 56). This has been generally rejected after much debate, for the course of which see J.Y. Campbell, 'The kingdom of God has come' (Exp.T. 48, 1936/7, pp.91-94), C.H. Dodd, 'The kingdom of God has come' (Exp.T. 48, 1936/7, pp.140-141), J.M. Creed, 'The kingdom of God has come' (Exp. T. 48, 1936/7, pp.184-185), C.T. Craig, 'Realized Eschatology' (JBL 56, 1937, pp.17-26), K. Clark, 'Realized Eschatology' (JBL 59, 1940, pp.367-383), M. Black, 'The kingdom of God has come' (Exp. T. 63, 1951/2, pp.289-290), H. Preisker, ἐγγύς, ἐγγύς, ἡ παρουσία (TDNT II, pp.330-332), R.H. Fuller, The Mission and of Jesus, London, 1954, pp.20-28, W.G. Kümmel, op.cit. pp.19-25.
22. T.W. Manson, Teaching of Jesus, pp.118-130, cf. 140-141. Cranfield, Mark pp.323-324, 380, identifies the kingdom with Jesus and even takes 1:15 in a spatial sense, cf. S. Schulz, loc.cit. (n.12 supra). Others who accept this interpretation at least for some of the passages are Taylor, Mark pp.412, 423-424, 431 (on 9:47; 10:14-15; 10:23-25), Schniewind, Mark p.128 (on 12:34), Schweizer, Mark pp.207, 253 (on 10:14-15; 12:34). Cf. also Wilson, Peake 708e, Mally, JBC II p.49.
23. R.N. Flew, op.cit. pp.25-26 (alongside other interpretations, cf. pp.21-22), Schniewind, Mark p.101 (on 10:15), Taylor, Mark pp. 489-490 (on 12:34).
24. Most modern scholars reject the traditional identification of the kingdom with the church (but cf. Mally, JBC II p.42, D.M. Stanley and R.E. Brown, JBC II p.783). Among those regarding the metaphor of entering the kingdom as implying a realm cf. Flew, op.cit. pp.24-26, Taylor, Mark p.412, Grundmann, Mark pp.207, 252-253, and most forcibly S. Aalen, '"Reign" and "House" in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels' (NTS 8, 1961/2, pp.215-240).
25. Dodd, Parables of the Kingdom pp.41-43, cf. 47 n.1, Grundmann, Mark p.199.
26. Kümmel, op.cit. pp.52-53, 125-131, Rawlinson, Mark pp.130, 136-137, 172, Taylor, Mark pp.114-116, Jeremias, Theology I p.100, E. Best, op.cit. pp.64-68. K.-G. Replöh, op.cit. p.188, argues that in 10:14 and 15b entering a completed future kingdom is meant, while the demand to receive the kingdom seems to refer to a present



### CHAPTER III

- blessing, cf. R. Schnackenburg, God's Rule and Kingdom, Edinburgh and London, 1963, p.142.
27. K.-G. Replöh, op.cit. pp.89-104, 123-140 gives a full redactional analysis. Cf. also Haenchen, 'Die Komposition von Mk 8:27 - 9:1 und Par.' (NovT 6, 1963, pp.81-109).
  28. Most recently Foster R. McCurley, Jr., 'And after six days (Mk 9:2). A semitic literary device' (JBL 93, 1974, pp.67-81) who claims that Mark uses temporal phrases to make transitions to new events and thinks that here the phrase is a climactic device to introduce the announcement by God of who Jesus is.
  29. Mark p.227.
  30. Op.cit. pp.116, 193-194. Cf. Schweizer, Mark pp.179-180.
  31. E. Best, op.cit. pp.121-122 stresses this: 'There is indeed no point in the Markan account where difficulty is caused by assuming that Mark identified the Son of man with Jesus, and there is much that causes difficulty if we suppose that Mark held that the Son of man was someone other than Jesus or that he was a corporate person'.
  32. S. Schulz, 'Die Bedeutung des Markus für die Theologie des Urchristentums' (Studia Evangelica II, 1964, p.141).
  33. In 12:35 it is introduced as a title used by the scribes, but no explanation of the origin or true nature of the messiah is given and the designation 'son of David' is rejected in the same decisive manner in which Jesus is represented as confounding his opponents in the preceding controversy stories.
  34. Jeremias, Parables p.73, Taylor, Mark pp.567-568, Cranfield, Mark p.443, Nineham, Mark p.407.
  35. In the other two gospels the anarthrous form occurs only in Mt 26:68 (voc.) and Lk 23:2. In view of this and the oddity of the phrase Taylor, Mark p.408 adopts a private suggestion by T.W. Manson that the original was ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι ἐμοὶ ἐστὶ, cf. Cranfield, Mark pp.312-313, but this may have been influenced by considerations of authenticity. The variant readings are probably scribal attempts to improve an awkward phrase.
  36. Mark p.181. So also Nineham, Mark p.83.
  37. Best, op.cit. p.16, claims that the demons recognize Jesus under the same category, Son of God, as he defeated their master in the temptation. He explains the other term used by the demons, the holy one of God (1:24) as emphasizing the irreconcilable difference between Jesus and the demonic powers through the contrast between ἅγιος and ἀκαθάρτος.
  38. There is some question of the true reading. Θ fam 13 472 543 565 700 1071 Geo Armen Origen have σὺ εἶπας ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι cf. Mt 26:64, Lk 22:70, which Taylor, Mark p.568 and Cranfield, Mark p.444 prefer, probably because they regard it as closer to the actual words of Jesus than because of the strength of the MS evidence.
  39. Taylor, The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching, London, 1958, pp.4, 7-8 recognizes this, although he does not pursue its implications. O.Cullmann, op.cit. pp.275-290 and R.H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, 1965, refs. to Fontana paperback, 1969, pp.114-115, are too concerned with



## CHAPTER III

the thought of Jesus to consider the theology of the gospel writers. But cf. E. Best, op.cit. p.17, 'For Mark the title Son of God is obviously the highest title that can be given; it is the title by which he would have his readers recognize Jesus as their Lord'.

40. W. Grundmann, δεσ, δεσν ἐστν (TDNT II, pp.21-25), M.D. Hooker, op.cit. p.107, H. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, London, 1960, p.153 n.2, H.E. Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, London, 1965, pp.188-193, denies that δεσ is pervaded by eschatological apocalyptic meaning and finds its basis in the fulfilment of scripture; he rejects Bultmann's view that the Passion is a 'horrible and inexplicable happening that has to be referred back to an incomprehensible divine δεσ, the understanding of which is a problem for the Church' (R. Bultmann, The Gospel of John, E.T. Oxford, 1971, p.632, with a reference to Mk 8:31).
41. History and Interpretation in the Gospels, London, 1935, p.92.
42. Mark p.442.
43. Cf. Dan, LXX (Ms 87), 8:17; 11:40 = נָוָה; 8:19; 11:35 = נָוָה; 11:45 (paraphrase); Theodotian has καρπός each time and uses ῥῆμα for נָוָה/נָוָה only at 9:21 where it refers to the hour of evening sacrifice. In Daniel the references are to the end time.
44. Mark p.233. Taylor, Mark p.392 sees this simply as an allusion to Dt 18:15.
45. Cf. Q. Quesnell, op.cit. pp.129-130, who sees Jesus depicted as 'the figure of destiny' whose fate is determined by the scriptures. But A. Suhl, Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate, Gütersloh, 1965, pp. 65-66, 132, 157-161, denies that Mark uses the scriptures in this way as prophecy and fulfilment.
46. Op.cit. chaps. III and IV. On the present passage see pp. 45-46, 51-53.
47. Op.cit. pp.28-30, 36, 41-42.
48. Op.cit. pp.181-182.
49. Op.cit. pp.145-150 (quotation on p.146, cf. p.154). See pp. 122-124 infra for a more detailed discussion.
50. Cf. e.g. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament I, E.T. 1952, pp.29-30. N. Perrin, The Rediscovery of the teaching of Jesus p.164, says, 'The apocalyptic sayings are sufficiently distinct from these others to warrant quite separate discussion'. F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, op.cit. I pp.375-377 tabulate the three types of Son of man sayings.
51. Cf. M.D. Hooker, op.cit. pp.180-181.
52. W. Wrede, op.cit., Rawlinson, Mark pp.258-262, Taylor, Mark pp.122-124, idem 'The Messianic Secret in Mark' (Exp.T. 59, 1947/8, pp.146-151), idem 'W. Wrede's The Messianic Secret in the Gospels' (Exp.T. 65, 1953/4, pp.246-250), idem 'The Messianic Secret in Mark. A rejoinder to the Rev. Dr. T.A. Burkill' (Hibbert Journal 55, 1956/7, pp.241-248), T.A. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation. An Examination of the Philosophy of St.



## CHAPTER III

- Mark's Gospel, Ithaca, 1963, passim, idem New Light on the Earliest Gospel pp.1-38, de Tillesse, op.cit., Ulrich Luz, 'Das Geheimnis-motiv und die markinische Christologie' (ZNW 56, 1965, pp.9-30, Erik Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien, Lund, 1955, G.H. Boobyer, 'The secrecy motif in St. Mark's Gospel' (NTS 6, 1959/60, pp.225-235).
53. Op.cit. pp.51-53 (quotation on p.52). Cranfield, art.cit. (SJT 7, 1954, p.288) also emphasizes this unity of the incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension and parousia as 'the last days' but (wrongly) claims that the parousia is simply held back to give men an opportunity to repent and believe. Thus 'the interval' (of nearly 2000 years!) is something essentially extra and supernumerary, an insertion added by the mercy of God'.
  54. Cf. W. Wink, John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition, Cambridge, 1968, p.xi.
  55. Op.cit. pp.54-67 (quotation on p.67).
  56. E. Best, op.cit. p.119, suggests that Elijah may be mentioned before Moses in Mark's account of the Transfiguration in contrast to the usual order which is followed in Matthew and Luke because Elijah is John the Baptist who suffers and dies and is therefore for Mark a more important figure than Moses. On the stress which Mark places on John's death see W. Wink, op.cit. pp.10-13, who adds (p.15) that Mark's reversal of the usual order is secondary since the Transfiguration scene has developed in the tradition into a new 'Sinai' theophany, and he must have had strong reasons for the change.
  57. Cf. E. Best, op.cit. pp.76, 135, who suggests that Mark used the tradition of the Baptist's death as 'a minor passion pointing to the greater passion', R.P. Martin, op.cit. pp.66-68, W. Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel, Nashville, 1969, pp.30-53, J.M. Robinson, op.cit. pp.21-32, U. Mauser, Christ in the Wilderness, London, 1963, pp.77-102, W. Wink, op.cit. pp.1-17. The last is a most important redactional study in which the author arrives at similar conclusions to those argued here, but makes too great a distinction between the three periods of the Old Testament, the preparation; Jesus' ministry, the resurrection, and the church; and the final consummation. He is right in stating that 'John's sufferings as Elijah-incognito prepares the way for the fate of Jesus, and serves as an example to the persecuted Christians in Rome' (although it is not absolutely certain that this is the correct destination), and in seeing that in Mark there is an underlying necessity of suffering followed by vindication, but he attributes to Mark an emphasis upon the resurrection and the era of the church which is alien to him.
  58. E. Best, op.cit. p.182, makes the point thus: 'Modern commentators, having decided that it is an early church creation, have apparently written it out of scripture and see no need to deal with it in detail'.
  59. Op.cit. p.182.
  60. Parables pp.149-150, cf. Taylor, Mark p.26.



## CHAPTER III

61. Op.cit. pp.79-81.
62. S. Schulz, op.cit. pp.151-153, sees that this is where Mark's emphasis lies, but he regards the interpretation of the parable as belonging to the experiences of the missionary church and denies that it is in any sense apocalyptic. E. Best, op.cit. pp.182-189, grasps the importance of the three dangers to believers and draws out further references to them in Mark, but his emphasis is somewhat distorted by his preoccupation with refuting J.M. Robinson's thesis.
63. Q. Quesnell, op.cit. p.80.
64. Mark p.259.
65. Mark p.140.
66. Op.cit. pp.81, 213.
67. Cf. Cranfield, Mark p.161, Q. Quesnell, op.cit. p.79.
68. For a complete survey of the literature up to 1954 see G.R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future, London, 1954. R. Pesch op.cit. pp.19-47, gives a useful account including later works and on pp.74-77 displays the analyses of some twenty-five scholars (slightly misleading for Cranfield and with a wrong page reference to Rawlinson). K. Grayston, art.cit. (BJRL 56, 1974, pp.371-387) discusses the analyses of Pesch, Schweizer, Hartmann, Lambrecht and Flückiger, and, rejecting any theory of an apocalyptic pamphlet, finds the nucleus of the chapter in an 'instruction leaflet' found in vv.7, 9, 11, 14-16, 18, 21, 23, 28-29, 33-35. Among recent studies may be noted L. Gaston, No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels, Suppl. to NovT 23, Leiden, 1970, and F. Rousseau, 'La Structure de Marc 13' (Biblica 56, 1975, pp.157-172). Some of the older writers accept the discourse as a unity and in a sense present a similar exposition to that set out infra, but their over hasty acceptance of authenticity leads to the construction of a harmony of the gospels and to many subjective assumptions. Cf. for both, Cranfield, art.cit. (SJT 6, 1953, pp.190, 195).
69. So R. Pesch, op.cit. This is a careful study of the relation of the chapter to the rest of the gospel and of the Markan redaction within the chapter. It is, however, impossible to accept the main argument for the view that the chapter was constructed by Mark after he had completed the rest of the gospel and inserted into it. While the analysis of the gospel into six sections of similar length and form (roughly 6 + 2 + 6 pericopae) into which it clearly does not fit is impressive, it is incredible that Mark should have intentionally used such a scheme as the basis of his work. To have done so would mean that he placed artistic symmetry above all other considerations and selected and arranged his material almost entirely on these grounds. The framework which Pesch discovers in Mark is largely his own invention, although it must be recognized that there are some features which make it possible to separate the chapter from the rest of Mark. The similarities are none-the-less greater than any differences. K. Grayston, art.cit. (BJRL 56, 1974, pp.37--387) holds, largely on the ground that in Mk 13 there is a unique



## CHAPTER III

speech of 39 sentences while elsewhere in Mark the sayings of Jesus do not extend beyond 6 sentences, that the passage is a pre-Markan pamphlet which Mark inserted into his gospel. He does not follow Pesch, however, in thinking that it was added to the completed gospel since he agrees with R.H. Lightfoot in tracing numerous links with the passion narrative.

70. So E. Trocmé, La Formation de l'Évangile selon Marc, Paris, 1963, (E.T. The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark, London, 1975), subjected to a detailed critique by T.A. Burkill in New Light on the Earliest Gospel pp.180-264. His separation of chaps. 1-13 from chaps. 14-16 leads him to far-reaching theories about the origin and message of the gospel, but his basis for this separation is largely the supposed differences in thought between the two sections and this is not convincing in face of the stylistic similarities between them.
71. Cf. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future pp.205, 210-212, A Commentary on Mark Thirteen pp.11-12.
72. Cf. the lack of agreement about the limits of the so-called 'little apocalypse' in the theories discussed by Beasley-Murray.
73. Jeremias, Parables p.14.
74. Cf. Taylor, Mark pp.638-641 and Bultmann, HST pp.122, 402-403, who seems to depend as much upon content as upon form in his analysis.
75. Op.cit. p.97. Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist, p.179, denies that any sequence of events is intended, at least in vv.5-13, which all belong to Mark's present, but this seems to be counter to the sense of the phrases which he quotes and is not fully consistent with his use of these terms to prove the unity of the chapter (pp.166-167).
76. There has been prolonged discussion on whether these words in v.4 have a single reference backward or look both backward and forward; see Taylor, Mark p.502, Cranfield, art.cit. (SJT 6, 1953, pp.195-196, idem, Mark pp.393-394, Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen pp.28-29, K. Grayston, art.cit. (BJRL 56, 1974, p.374).
77. Marxsen, op.cit. pp.166-167, points this out.
78. Marxsen, ibid.
79. Mark p.237.
- 79a. Mark Thirteen p.18. Cf. R.H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark p.50, L. Hartman, Prophecy Interpreted. The Formation of some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par., Lund, 1966, pp. 175, 207-209, 236, Cranfield, Mark p.388; H.E. Tødt, op.cit. p.189, sees an element of exhortation in the Dec of v.7. Grayston, art.cit. (BJRL 56, 1974, pp.376-379, 383-385), finds the clue to an understanding of the chapter in four imperatives following temporal clauses, vv. 7, 11, 14, 21.
80. Accepting γινώσκετε (v.29) as an imperative with R.V. against R.S.V. and N.E.B.



## CHAPTER III

81. Cranfield, art.cit. (SJT 7, 1954, pp.296-299), cf. Mark p.412, produces a positive sense only by importing an interpretation from Mt 25, Rom 13:8-14, 1 Pet 4:7-11, Phil 4:4-7, 1 Thess 5:7-11 and Heb 10:24-25.
82. Haenchen's interpretation (Mark pp.444-447) is attractive. He suggests that the verses mean that when Christians see preparations for sacrifice to the emperor being prepared, those in Judaea, i.e. Christians, should flee to the mountains as Mattathias and his sons had done during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. The strength of this is that it conforms to similar addresses to the reader in other apocalypses, e.g. Rev 13:18 where attention is drawn to symbolic cyphers. Its weakness is that it assumes that Mark understood Daniel to be referring to Maccabaeian times and that this would be the sole instance in his gospel where Judaea stands for Christians. L. Hartman, op.cit. p.241, suggests that 'it is not impossible' that there is a reminiscence of 1 Macc 2 here.
83. Cf. Cranfield, art.cit. (SJT 6, 1953, p.297), Mark p.401.
84. L. Hartman, op.cit. p.176, perhaps senses this when he notes a difference in content between the admonitions in the 'midrash' and the concluding admonitions (cf. also pp.174-177, 207-226, 235-242).
85. The similarities with the accusation before the high priest (14:58, cf. 15:29), the saying recorded in Jn 2:19, and the charge made against Stephen (Acts 6:14) suggest that a saying about the destruction of the temple was widely reported in several different cycles of tradition.
86. Cf. Taylor, Mark p.502 and Cranfield, art.cit. (SJT 6, 1953, p.195), Mark pp.393-394.
87. So Lohmeyer, Mark p.269, Schniewind, Mark p.133, Schweizer, Mark pp.267-268, Marxsen, op.cit. p.168, Hartman, op.cit. p.221, Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen p.28.
88. Cranfield, loc.cit. L. Gaston, op.cit. pp.61-64, 468-483, stresses that it was Mark who linked the destruction (not deseccration) of the temple with the parousia.
89. Cranfield offers two interpretations of the first and five of the second (Mark p.395, cf. art.cit. (SJT 6, 1953, p.288). Cf. Taylor, Mark pp.503-504, who regards  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \epsilon\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \mu\epsilon\nu$  as a Christian addition to a Jewish or Jewish-Christian source. Schweizer, Mark pp.268-269, holds that the words indicate that these deceivers come from within the Christian community and adds that the expectation that 'many' such persons as those depicted <sup>would come</sup> here, was not fulfilled in the time of Mark, concluding from this that Mark did not expect the end to come in the immediate future. Haenchen, Mark pp.437-440, rejects this line of interpretation, arguing that the reference is simply to movements like that of Theudas which could be understood as messianic.
90. This double reference is often regarded as evidence that different sources have been used in the chapter. Even if this were so, there is no basic contradiction between the two statements.



## CHAPTER III

91. Different views are adopted as to where description ends and prophecy begins, often based upon the question of whether any part of the chapter is vaticinia ex eventu and refers to the siege of Jerusalem. Marxsen, op.cit. pp.171, 177-179, holds that the prophecy begins at v.14, while de Tillesse, op.cit. pp. 420-438, esp. 424-427, thinks that the chapter down to v.23 describes Mark's own times and that only vv.24-27 refer to the future. Apocalyptic frequently describes the past as if it were still future, and the ultimate question is to decide at what point in the scheme Mark believed that he was living.
92. There is no need to omit γὰρ with W 245 247 sah geo<sup>1</sup> b i k l q (cf. Taylor, Mark p.505), but even if the asyndeton is accepted, the 'birth pangs' comprise all these events.
93. Cranfield, Mark p.396, commenting on ἅλλ' οὕτως το τελευτος, 'These things do not constitute a sign that the End is just round the corner'. Marxsen, op.cit. pp.172-189, also stresses the importance of this phrase, but in his view Mark is simply drawing a distinction between the events which are actually occurring and the decisive coming of the Son of man and the End which is none-the-less imminent. Several commentators see in this passage a warning against a view current in the sixties that the contemporary wars were a sign that the end of the world was near (cf. Schweizer, Mark p.269, Nineham, Mark p.346, Haenchen, Mark pp. 440-441, Trocmé, op.cit. pp.162-168, E.T. pp.205-214).
94. Passages often quoted are Sib Or iii. 635; v. 375-380; 4 Ezra 13:29-32; 1 Enoch 99:4-5; 2 Bar 27:7; 70:3, 8, as well as a number of O.T. passages, most of which are not strictly apocalyptic, e.g. Is 8:21; 13:13; 14:30; 19:2; Jer 23:19; Ezek 5:12; Hag 2:6; Zech 14:4-5.
95. E.g. 4 Ezra 5:9; 6:24; Jub 23:19; 2 Bar 50:3.
96. Even Cranfield, Mark pp.399-400, thinks this likely, though hastening to add that this does not impugn its authenticity. Beasley-Murray defends the connexion between vv.9 and 10 (Mark Thirteen p.41). Cf. also H.E. Tødt, op.cit. p.189 and Kümmel, op.cit. pp.54-55. K. Grayston, art.cit. (BJRL 56, 1974, pp.380, 385), includes it among the pre-Markan apocalyptic glosses added to the 'instruction' leaflet.
97. So Cranfield, Mark p.399, cf. pp.484-485.
98. Op.cit. pp.174-177.
- 98a. Whether the events of the Gentile mission underlie vv.9, 11-13 is disputed, Bultmann, HST p.122, and Lohmeyer, Mark p.272, asserting this, Wellhausen, Mark p.102, holding that nothing in the verses presupposes anything outside Palestine. Taylor, Mark p.507, suggests that authentic sayings have been selected and adapted according to the later interests of the church. Kilpatrick, 'The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mark 13:9-11' (Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955, pp.145-158) and 'Mark 13:9-10' (JTS, ns 9, 1958, pp.81-86) argued on the basis of a repunctuation of the passage that there is no mention of a Gentile mission here, but this has not been generally accepted (cf. Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen pp.42-44, J. Lambrecht, op.cit. pp.129-130, 133-135, A. Farrer, 'An



## CHAPTER III

- examination of Mark 13:10' (JTS, ns 7, 1956, pp.75-79), C.F.D. Moule, Review of 'Studies in the Gospels' (JTS, ns 7, 1956, p.281). Although we must not interpret Mark from Acts, it is suggestive that persecution is frequently depicted as arising out of the Gentile mission (cf. Acts 6:13-14; 7; 13:50; 14:2-5, 19; 17:5, 13; 18:6, 12-13; 21:27-36; 22:22-23; 23:12-24; 24:5-9).
99. He probably links the Holy Spirit with the teaching of the O.T. that there would be an outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the messianic age (e.g. Is 11:1-2; 12:1; 61:1; Joel 2:28-29).
  100. L. Hartman, op.cit. p.150, opposes the view of Taylor, Mark p.510, and Cranfield, Mark p.401, that εἰς τέλος means 'finally', 'to the end', 'right through', 'completely' by pointing to these links.
  101. The R.V., R.S.V. paragraphing with the heavy 'But' contributes to this misunderstanding. The Greek links the section with δε.
  102. This view is adopted by Klostermann, Mark p.135, Rawlinson, Mark pp.187-188, Branscomb, Mark pp.237-238, Schniewind, Mark p.137, Grundmann, Mark pp.266-267, Streeter, op.cit. pp.492-493, T.F. Glasson, The Second Advent. The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine, London, 3rd edit. 1963, p.197. Others are somewhat more tentative: Cranfield, Mark p.402, cf. art.cit. (SJT 6, 1953, pp.298-300), who asserts that the prophecy was not fulfilled without remainder in the events of A.D. 66-70, Nineham, Mark pp.352-354, who seems to favour the view of Bacon that the underlying reference is to the Caligula incident (cf. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark pp.319-320, cf. 53-134; Bacon held that Mark wrote after the events of A.D.70 and constructed chap. 13 out of the little apocalypse, Q, and Luke's special source; the original meaning of the apocalypse has, therefore, been modified), Taylor, Mark p.511, who points to the mysteriousness of the phrase, Schweizer, Mark p.272, Mally, JBC II pp.51-52, who sees a cryptic reference to the desecration of Jerusalem by a foreign power. Wilson, Peake 709e, thinks that it is merely an echo of Daniel in a prophecy of trials similar to those of an earlier age, while T.W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp.329-330, maintains that the prophecy underlying both Mark and Luke was closer to the Lukan form, it having been modified in Mark in the light of the events of A.D. 40. Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen, pp.54-57, 59-72, gives a detailed account of interpretations of the phrase, his own view being that Jesus foresaw the entry of the Roman armies into Jerusalem bearing their standards. J. Lambrecht, op.cit. pp.144-154, also sets out various views, he himself holding that Mark teaches that after the profanation of the temple by some person a destructive war will follow, but it is useless to seek closer identifications, rightly adding that it is inadmissible to interpret Mark from Luke. L. Hartman, op.cit. p.152, thinks it probable that the symbol refers to 'some form of blasphemy which will characterize the last days', and that in the present form of the text the devastation of Jerusalem and Judaea was associated with it.
  103. Interpretations vary according to whether the theory of an apocalyptic fly-sheet is adopted or not, and whether the saying about the abomination of desolation is regarded as an authentic saying of Jesus or a later construction. Even



## CHAPTER III

- Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen p.57, thinks that the phrase is Markan and is intended either to draw attention to the text of Daniel or to appeal to the reader to look below the surface. Nineham, Mark p.354, suggests that it was perhaps addressed to the public reader, who is called on to explain the meaning of the allusion to his hearers. H.A. Guy, 'Mark 13:14' (Exp.T. 65, 1953/4, p.30), makes a similar point, although he suggests that it was to ensure that the reader did not mistakenly substitute the neuter participle for the masculine, cf. L. Gaston, op.cit. p.28.
104. Few commentators make a definite decision between these. Of those who do we may note Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen p.55, who says that it is purely desecratory, and R. Pesch, op.cit. p.143, who argues that since the destruction of the temple is so clearly prophesied in 13:2, this verse must refer to that destruction. L. Gaston, op.cit. pp.23-29, suggests that in the original oracle from the time of the Caligula incident, the reference was to the desecration of the temple but that Mark reinterpreted it as its destruction (which ushers in the final act of the eschatological drama). By contrast Schmid, Mark pp.242-243, stresses that Mark refers to profanation and points to the close parallel in 2 Thess 2:3ff. where the Anti-Christ sits in the temple of God.
105. L. Festinger, H.W. Riecken, S. Schachter, When Prophecy Fails, New York, 1956, give a fascinating account of a tiny sect, the members of which believed that the end of the world was imminent and that they would be carried off in flying saucers, and offer instructive parallels to the imminent hope seen in the New Testament. They posit a sociological theory to explain the reactions of the members involved. The 'Sunday' programme broadcast by the B.B.C. on 11th January, 1976 included letters from Jehovah's Witnesses concerning the failure of Armageddon to arrive in 1975, some reinterpreting the prophecy, others pointing to Mk 13:32/Mt 24:26, one other claiming that it had arrived with an interesting realized eschatology, and one abandoning the movement.
106. The War Scroll from Qumran illustrates this difficulty. Scholars are divided as to whether this describes a purely eschatological war or whether the writers envisaged a holy war against their national enemies which was decked out in eschatological, even apocalyptic, imagery. Y. Yadin's arguments that the descriptions follow the practice and terminology of the Roman army have been widely accepted (cf. The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, Oxford, 1962, esp. p.15), yet few are prepared to go as far as E. Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran, München, 2nd edit. 1971, p.177, 'Für Ausrüstung, Aufstellung und Kampfweise der Truppen werden recht genaue Anweisungen erteilt, aus denen hervorgeht, dass der Krieg als ein wirklicher Kampf dargestellt werden soll'. By contrast G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Harmondsworth, 3rd. edit. 1968, pp.123-124, holds that the scroll is purely theological writing and 'symbolizes the eternal struggle between the spirits of Light and Darkness'. J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, London, 1959, pp.121-123, is perhaps closer to the correct interpretation when he describes the war



### CHAPTER III

as essentially eschatological, but adds that in the situation leading up to the Jewish revolt it would have been useful propaganda for the zealots. In the thought of the first Christian century no clear distinction appears to have been made between historical and eschatological events.

107. Cf. J. Schreiber, Theologie des Vertrauens. Eine Redaktions-geschichtliche Untersuchung des Markusevangeliums, Hamburg, 1967, pp.127, 185-188, K. Grayston, art.cit. (BJRL 56, 1974, pp.371-373), L. Gaston, op.cit. pp.75-90, 473-481. Note also 14:58.
108. Cf. Dan 12:7, 1 Enoch 80:2, 4 Ezra 4:26-43, 2 Bar 20:1 and the references in Strack-Billerbeck I, p.953.
109. G.R. Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen p.78, notes that this is a phrase used by both Josephus and Plato for emphasis.
110. So Taylor, Mark pp.502-503, 515, Schniewind, Mark p.133, Schmid, Mark p.244, Wilson, Peake 709e. Others are less certain. Marxsen, op.cit. p.185 (cf. p.162), accepts that there may have been two sources but adds that 'in Mark's context there is no doublet here'. Mally, JBC II p.52, notes the similarity of structure and content but is not prepared to say that it is a doublet, and Cranfield, Mark p.405, thinks that it is 'possibly but not necessarily' a variant of vv.5-6. Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen p.84, denies outright that vv.21-22 repeat v.6. The words are of special importance for Pesch's theory, since he holds that the prophecy about the deceivers was part of the apocalyptic flysheet and that Mark adapted this for his own purposes by inserting vv.5b, 6b, 21 and  $\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\chi\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  in v.22 in order to apply the reference to those who saw in the destruction of the temple a sign of the imminence of the end (op.cit. pp.107-118, 225).
111. Most hold v.23 to be Markan (so Taylor, Mark p.517, who calls it one of the linchpins holding the discourse together, Schmid, Mark p.244, Grundmann, Mark p.268, Lambrecht, op.cit. p.171) or at least as a Christian formulation (so Bultmann, HST pp. 130, 151, Klostermann, Mark p.136). Nineham sees vv.21-23 as a cento of sayings added by Mark to reinforce the warnings in vv.5-6 (Mark p.355). Cranfield, Mark p.405, attempts to belittle the element of prophecy by interpreting the phrase as 'You have been adequately warned!', but  $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\pi\eta\gamma\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$  is used of prophetic announcements (Acts 1:16, Rom 9:29) and of teaching given previously (2 Cor 7:3; 13:2, Jude 17) as Taylor, Mark p.516, shows.
112. Taylor, Mark p.517, finds inconsistencies and artificiality in 'in those days' and 'after that tribulation', and he explains it by reference to sources. It is not clear that the inconsistencies exist and even if they do, such features in an apocalyptic writing need not lead us to posit sources.
113. E.g. Is 13:10; 24:23; 34:4; Joel 2:30-31; 3:15; Amos 8:9; Ezek 32:7-8; 1 Enoch 80:2-7; 102:2; 4 Ezra 4:51 - 5:13; Ass.Mos 10:5.
114. Scholars are divided on this. Among those who favour a literal interpretation are Taylor, Mark p.518, Klostermann, Mark p.137, Schniewind, Mark p.139, Schmid, Mark p.245,



## CHAPTER III

- Conzelmann, *σκότος καὶ λ.* (TDNT VII p.440), cf. Nineham, Mark p.357, 'here the idea is at least quasi-literal - the picture is of the general break-up of the universe', M.D. Hooker, op.cit. p.150, 'The fact that Mark himself may have interpreted these events literally does not mean that the individual sayings were originally intended to be understood literally'. Of those who accept the view that the language is symbolic we may note Swete, Mark p.311, Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen pp.87-88, Pesch, op.cit. pp.158-159, Huby-Benoit, Mark p.74, Moule, Mark p.102, Hartman, op.cit. p.249, cf. 141, Carrington, Mark pp.281-282, A.N. Wilder, 'Eschatological imagery and earthly circumstances' (NTS 5, 1958/9, pp.229-245). Cranfield's comment, 'that this is picture-language which we must not seek to compress into a literal interpretation should go without saying' (Mark p.406) not only does not do justice to the scholarly discussion which the passage has evoked, but is somewhat inconsistent with his own acceptance of vv.26-27 as literally true, even though 'how the elect will be gathered (is) quite beyond our comprehension'. The passage is of a piece and if one part is to be explained away as picture language so must the other. A general comment on Cranfield's approach could be that he is too heavily dependent upon Calvin and shows too little imaginative sympathy with the culture of the first century Christian church.
115. Cf. T.F. Glasson, op.cit. and J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, London, 1957.
116. Is 11:11, 16; 27:12; Zech 2:6-11; 10:6-11, 1 Enoch 57; 61; Ps Sol 11:3.
117. Cf. e.g. Lohmeyer, Mark p.279, Schmid, Mark p.245, Schweizer, Mark p.276. Grayston, art.cit. (BJRL 56, 1974, pp.379-380), asserts that the marks of apocalyptic are scarce in the whole chapter. The definition of apocalyptic both as an attitude or system of belief and as a type of literature presents serious problems. Grayston uses the eight characteristic motifs set out by K. Koch, The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic, London, 1972, pp.28-33, as the yardstick by which to test Mk 13, but he fails to mention the formal features which Koch discusses earlier in the chapter (pp.24-28). One of these is 'paraenetic discourses' in which the seer exhorts his readers. On the basis of Koch's analysis it would appear that the chapter, treated as a whole, falls well within the category of apocalyptic. Indeed, Koch's book was written to reaffirm the presence of apocalyptic thought in the teaching of Jesus.
118. Cf. A.L. Moore, The Parousia in the New Testament, Leiden, 1966, who puts forward the curious view that the expectation of both Jesus and the early church was of an imminent End which was not 'delimited' in the sense that it was pre-determined by God and precisely predicted by prophets (his discussion of 13:28-30 is on pp.131-136, 177-181). Cranfield, Mark p.408, argues that the incarnation-crucifixion-resurrection-ascension on the one hand and the parousia on the other form 'one Event' in the action of God and are held apart only by God's mercy in giving men opportunity for faith and repentance. Thus the parousia is 'always imminent' now that the first part of this 'divine Act' has happened.



## CHAPTER III

119. As R.V., R.S.V., and N.E.B.mg.
120. N.E.B. supplies 'the end' but this is paraphrase.
121. Matthew and Luke record the parable with minor, though significant changes. Apart from word order Matthew follows Mark verbally except for the addition of πάντα (ταῦτα) in Mt 24:33 = Mk 13:29, apparently equating this with the identical phrase in the next verse. Luke's introduction is different and he adds a reference to 'all the trees'. At the end he provides ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ as the subject of ἔγγυς ἔστιν and omits ἐπὶ θύραις. Many commentators argue for a different setting of the parable in the life of Jesus and suggest that it referred originally to the whole earthly ministry (so Dodd, op.cit. p.137 n.1, Jeremias, Parables pp.119-120, Taylor, Mark p.520, Nineham, Mark p.359, Schweizer, Mark p.278). Grundmann, Mark p.270, makes this distinction but thinks that the original reference was to 'das Reich Gottes als wunderbare Weltvollendung', as does Kümmel, op.cit. pp.20-22. There is a variety of interpretations both of the meaning of ταῦτα and of the subject of ἔγγυς ἔστιν. (a) ταῦτα. It is generally recognized that this cannot include the whole of vv.24-27 because this would make the coming of the Son of man a sign of his coming. The allusion is therefore interpreted either by reference to earlier sections of the chapter (Grundmann, Mark p.270, Cranfield, Mark pp.407-408, Nineham, Mark p.359, earlier Lagrange, Mark p.324), or vaguely as the signs, events, or portents before the end (cf. Rawlinson, Mark p.191, Schweizer, Mark p.281, Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen p.97, Marxsen, op.cit. p.187, Pesch, op.cit. pp.180-181, A.L. Moore, op.cit. p.180, Kümmel, op.cit. p.21, Jeremias, Parables p.119). (b) ἔγγυς ἔστιν. The subject is explained as (1) the Son of man or the messiah (Montefiore, Mark p.306, Huby-Benoit, Mark p.74, Klostermann, Mark p.138, Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen p.97, Grundmann, Mark p.270, Pesch, op.cit. pp.180-181, Lambrecht, op.cit. p.201, Moore, op.cit. p.180; (2) the parousia (Cranfield, Mark p.408, Schweizer, Mark p.281); (3) the kingdom of God (Nineham, Mark, 'possibly'); (4) indeterminate (Rawlinson, Mark p.191, Taylor, Mark p.520, Schmid, Mark p.247, Kümmel, op.cit. p.21). Trocmé, op.cit. E.T. pp.213-214 n.1, notes that all commentators say that if Mark is to be taken literally the parousia must be included among the signs of the end and all 'with a unanimity rarely equalled' reject this idea. He questions this, suggesting that 'summer' (v.28) signifies the judgement and the solemn institution of the kingdom of God which are not mentioned in vv.24-27.
122. E.g. by giving unusual interpretations to ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς or by referring ταῦτα πάντα to other events than those of vv.24-27. Thus with respect to ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς commentators frequently refer to Jerome's comment on Mt 24:34 'aut omne genus hominum ... aut specialiter judaeorum' and Theophylact's τὸν τέτοντον τῶν πτωχῶν. Among modern writers adopting similar interpretations cf. Schniewind, Mark pp.141-142. Swete, Mark p.315, acknowledges that the most natural meaning is to apply it to the contemporaries of Jesus, but adds, 'It is possible that a word was purposely



## CHAPTER III

- employed which was capable of being understood in a narrower or a wider sense, according to the interpretation assigned to the passage by the hearer or reader'. L. Hartman, op.cit. pp.224-225, regards the saying in 13:30-31 as a construction combining a Markan tradition with that in Mt 23:36, cf. 5:18, i.e. a judgement saying against the Jews was interpreted as referring to the imminent fall of Jerusalem. Most, however, accept the temporal sense of 'generation' as the contemporaries of Jesus (e.g. Lohmeyer, Mark p.281, Rawlinson, Mark p.192, Branscomb, Mark p.239, Cranfield, Mark p.409, Nineham, Mark pp.359-360, Schmid, Mark pp.248-249, Schweizer, Mark pp.281-282, Grundmann, Mark pp.270-271, Haenchen, Mark p.451, Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future pp.185-186, 260, idem Mark Thirteen pp.99-100, Kümmel, op.cit. pp.60-61, Pesch, op.cit. pp.184-186, Lambrecht, op.cit. pp.204-206, Marxsen, op.cit. p.195, Moore, op.cit. p.132, E. Grässer, Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in der synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte, ZNW Beiheft 22, Berlin, 2nd ed. 1960. Lohmeyer and Schmid find derogatory overtones in the phrase. As to ταῦτα πάντα three alternatives to the more obvious reference generally to the events related in the whole chapter or specifically to the parousia or the end of the world have been suggested. The words refer to the signs of the approaching end Moore, op.cit. pp.132-135, Cranfield, Mark p.409, who adds that Jesus' hearers must themselves experience the signs of the End because 'they are characteristic of the whole period of the Last Times'); or to the destruction of the temple (Lagrange, Mark pp.324-325, Huby-Benoit, Mark pp.74-75, Taylor, Mark p.521, Hartman, op.cit. p.225, Glasson, op.cit. p.116, Taylor and Glasson regarding this as the original meaning of the saying and J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming: the emergence of a doctrine, London, 1957, p.125, suggesting that the reference is to judgement on the nation); or to the passion and the resurrection (Lightfoot, Gospel Message p.54, after drawing out parallels between Mk 13 and the passion narrative says that the passion was the first fulfilment of the prophecy, cf. O. Cullmann, The Early Church, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, London, 1956, pp.152-154).
123. Kümmel, op.cit. p.150 emphasizes this. See also Lohmeyer, Mark p.283, Schnackenburg, op.cit. pp.211-214.
124. P.W. Schmiedel, art.cit. (EB II col. 1881). Among those accepting the authenticity of the verse cf. Lohmeyer, Mark p.283, Schniewind, Mark p.141, Branscomb, Mark pp.239-240, Taylor, Mark pp.439, 522, Cranfield, Mark p.410, Nineham, Mark p.361 (possibly), Johnson, Mark p.219, Schmid, Mark p.248, Grundmann, Mark p.271, Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen pp.105-106, Kümmel, op.cit. p.42, Glasson, op.cit. pp.93-94, Schnackenburg, op.cit. pp.210-211, cf. p.196, Moore, op.cit. pp.99-100. Lambrecht, op.cit. pp.238-239, thinks that the content may be authentic but the form Markan. J.A.T. Robinson, op.cit. pp.86-87, and Pesch, op.cit. pp.190-195, hold that the sense has been changed by the new context, Pesch claiming that it has been carefully edited.
125. Several point to additions which have been made to an earlier saying to achieve this: A. Loisy, Les Évangiles Synoptiques II, Ceffonds, 1908, p.438, Klostermann, Mark p.138, Montefiore, Mark



## CHAPTER III

- p.307, Bultmann, HST p.123. Grässer, op.cit. pp.81-84, sets out the theory of the 'delay' most forcibly. Others who question the authenticity of the saying are Schweizer, Mark p.279, Nineham, Mark p.361, Haenchen, Mark pp.452-453, F. Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology, London, 1969, p.313, C.K. Barrett, Jesus and the Gospel Tradition, London, 1967, pp.25-26, G. Vermes, Jesus the Jew, pp.200-201. Pesch, loc.cit., accepts that the verse has been carefully edited by Mark, but strongly opposes the theory that this was done in face of distress at the delay of the parousia.
126. So Haenchen, Mark p.452, who quotes a parallel from a modern newspaper. This is also offered by Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen pp.107-108, Grundmann, Mark p.271, and Pesch, op.cit. pp.190-195. Moore, op.cit. pp.134-135, removes the apparent contradiction by referring v.30 to the preliminary signs and v.32 to the end itself. Kümmel, op.cit. pp.149-151, had already rejected this view as conjecture.
127. Most commentators stress the composite nature of this section and claim that it was compiled by Mark on the catch-word principle (cf. Taylor, Mark pp.519-520). The similarities with Mt 5:18 and Lk 16:17 have frequently been noted and the verse explained as a Christian or Markan adaptation of some word of Jesus (part of a 'Christian' source, Marxsen, op.cit. pp.162, 187; a Christian formulation, Bultmann, HST p.123; pre-Markan, Schweizer, Mark p.282, Haenchen, Mark p.452, Pesch, op.cit. p.190; Markan redaction, Lambrecht, op.cit. pp.212-227). Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future p.39, says that Weiffenbach, Die Wiederkunfts-gedanke Jesu, Leipzig, 1873, regarded it as the conclusion of the 'Little Apocalypse'. Kümmel, op.cit. p.91, Cranfield, Mark p.410 and Beasley-Murray, Mark Thirteen pp.103-104, maintain that it is an authentic saying, although even the last two very conservative scholars doubt whether it is in its original context.
128. ἀνεῳκται by itself does not imply a long absence from home, as many assume, seeing in this verse an indication of the pressure which the delay in the coming of the parousia exerted upon the early church (cf. Bultmann, HST p.119, Jeremias, Parables pp. 53-55, Nineham, Mark p.361, Grässer, op.cit. pp.86-88). Pesch, op.cit. pp.197-199, may be correct, however, in seeing in τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, which he regards as a Markan addition to the parable, an indication that an interval between the resurrection and the parousia was expected, although this need not have been very long. The common view that the parable was formed out of features derived from the parables of the talents and the pounds and the teaching in Lk 12:35-46 (cf. Rawlinson, Mark p.193, Taylor, Mark p.524, Cranfield, Mark p.412, Nineham, Mark p.361, Schmid, Mark p.412, Haenchen, Mark p.453) is unconvincing.
129. As Taylor, Mark p.523, says, 'the church is in daily expectation of the return of its Lord'.
130. καὶ προσευχεσθαι in v.33 is probably an addition to Mark's text (B D 122 k a c omit) and even if original would not suggest any particular service or moral requirement.
131. Mark, loc.cit., J.H. Moulton and W.F. Howard, A Grammar of New Testament Greek II, Edinburgh, 1929, p.290.



## CHAPTER III

132. While in classical Greek the verb appears to refer to lying awake, suffering from insomnia, in Dan 9:14 (LXX, =  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\psi\iota$ ), Wis 6:15; Lk 21:36; Eph 6:18 and Heb 13:17 it is used metaphorically of being watchful. The subject of the verb in Dan 9:14 is the Lord and the passage is not closely parallel to the present one. Wis 6 is concerned with seeking and obtaining wisdom, and  $\acute{\alpha}\gammaρυπνεῖν$  is one of the metaphors used to indicate the eagerness with which the seeker should desire wisdom, the other metaphors being loving and seeking her, rising early to seek her and fixing one's thought upon her. Little beyond the eagerness of the quest may be seen here. Lk 21:34-36 is the Lukan conclusion of the apocalyptic discourse. As in the TR of the present text, watching is linked with prayer ( $\deltaεσμεναι$  not  $\piροσευχόμεναι$ ) to escape 'all these things that shall come to pass' and to stand before the Son of man, a thought probably akin to the petition to be saved from the eschatological time of testing in the Lord's prayer. The watchfulness is contrasted with having hearts 'overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life' ( $\betaαρυθωσιν \dots \acute{\epsilon}\nu \kappa\rho\alpha\tau\iota\pi\lambda\eta\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\theta\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota\varsigma \beta\omega\tau\iota\kappa\iota\varsigma$ ), thus attaching a moral sense to the call. In Eph 6:18 watching is joined to prayer and indeed does little more than reinforce the urgency, being almost devoid of eschatological force. The writer to the Hebrews uses the verb of the church leaders who 'watch' on behalf the members  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  (adding an eschatological dimension to what is otherwise a pastoral concern. Cf. Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford, 1940, I p.16, A Oepke,  $\gamma\rho\gamma\gamma\omicron\rho\epsilon\omega$  (TDNT II pp.338-339); Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, pp.14-15, translate 'be on the alert' (cf. 1 Esd 8:58, N.E.B. 'be vigilant', 2 Esd 8:29 = Ezra 8:29  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\psi\iota$ ). I have not had access to E. Loevestam, Spiritual Wakefulness in the New Testament, Lund, 1963.
133.  $\gamma\rho\gamma\gamma\omicron\rho\epsilon\omega$  is used as a synonym of  $\acute{\alpha}\gammaρυπνεῖν$  in Theodotian's version of Dan 9:14. R.C. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, London, 1906, does not discuss the two words. Oepke, art.cit. (TDNT II pp.338-339) treats them as virtually identical in meaning, listing the uses in the N.T. passages. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, p.166, translate '(lit.) be or keep awake', '(fig.) be on the alert, be watchful'. E. Best, First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, London, 1972, pp.211-212, translates  $\gamma\rho\gamma\gamma\omicron\rho\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$  in 1 Thess 5:6 by 'alert' and suggests that Paul's use of the word is an indication that he is drawing on traditional eschatological material and claims that the word implies wakefulness and full awareness of what is happening.
134. In Mk 13:36; 14:37, 40-41; Mt 25:5; 26:40, 43, 45; 1 Thess 5:6 (cf. 5:10  $\gamma\rho\gamma\gamma\omicron\rho\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$  = to be alive contrasted with  $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$  = to die) sleep is mentioned, while  $\acute{\alpha}\gammaρυπνία$  is implied in the parables of the Thief in the Night and the Servants watching for the return of their master from the marriage feast (Mt 24:43/ Lk 12:39, unless  $\acute{\alpha}\gammaρυπνίαν$  is omitted with  $\acute{\alpha}$  D W Syr<sup>vet</sup> e i Copt<sup>Sah</sup> codd. Armen Marcion; Lk 12:36-38) and is contrasted with drunken stupor in 1 Thess 5:6; 1 Pet 5:8 (cf. Mt 24:49). A majority of passages are eschatological and speak of the coming of Christ, often with the metaphor of the sudden appearance of a thief (besides Mk 13:24, 35, 37 cf. Mt 24:42, 43; Lk 12:37, (39); 1 Thess 5:6; Rev 3:2, 3; 16:15). Of the



## CHAPTER III

remaining passages Acts 20:31 deals with pastoral care (cf. Heb 13:17), Col 4:2 reinforces a call to prayer and 1 Cor 16:13 is part of general moral exhortation.

135. Pesch, op.cit. pp.187-188, 240-242, argues, however, that the *Naherwartung* is found only in chap. 13 and is not prominent in the body of the gospel. 13:26, like 8:38 and 14:62, was originally a threat of judgement and only became an expression of expectation of the future parousia when it was opposed to the false hopes current at the time when chap. 13 was added to the gospel. Pesch also sees 9:1 as a word of consolation in face of the delay which Mark reinterpreted as being fulfilled in the Transfiguration.
136. It is this which presents one of the main difficulties for Marxsen's theories, and his rather obscure language perhaps reveals his embarrassment (see esp. op.cit. pp.112-113, cf. Rohde, op.cit. p.139).
137. Among the large literature note R.H. Lightfoot, Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels, London, 1938, pp.62-77, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, pp.80-97, 106-116, A.M. Farrer, A study in St. Mark, London, 1951, pp.172-181, idem St. Matthew and St. Mark, London, 1954, pp.144-159, Cranfield, 'St. Mark 16:1-8' (SJT 5, 1952, pp.282-298, 398-414, esp. pp.405-409), C.F. Evans, Resurrection and the New Testament, London, 1970, pp.67-75, K. Aland, 'Bemerkungen zum Schluss der Markus-evangeliums' (in Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in honour of Matthew Black, ed. E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox, Edinburgh, 1969, pp.157-180, P.W. Van der Horst, 'Can a book end with *καρ*? A note on Mark 16:8' (JTS ns. 23, 1972, pp.121-124), G.W. Trompf, 'The first resurrection appearance and the ending of Mark's gospel' (NTS 18, 1972, pp.308-330), K. Aland, 'Der Schluss der Markusevangeliums' (Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. 34, 1974, pp.435-470) as well as the commentaries. Important earlier studies include B.H. Streeter, op.cit. pp.333-360, R.R. Ottley, '*ἐφελκυοντο καρ*' (JTS 27, 1926, pp.407-409), C.H. Kraeling, 'Mark 16:8' (JBL 44, 1925, pp.357-358), M.S. Enslin, '*ἐφελκυοντο καρ*, Mark 16:8' (JBL 46, 1927, pp.62-68), H.J. Cadbury, 'Mark 16:8' (JBL 46, 1927, pp.344-345), J.M. Creed, 'The conclusion of the gospel according to St. Mark' (JTS 31, 1930, pp.175-180).\*
138. So A.M. Farrer, St. Matthew and St. Mark, p.150, conjectures that 16:8 might have been followed by 'But Jesus sent forth his disciples to preach the gospel amongst all nations'. Moule, 'St. Mark 16:8 once more' (NTS 2, 1955/6, pp.58-59) suggests that the phrase *εἶχεν καρ αὐτὰς τρομος ... ἐφελκυοντο καρ* was a parenthesis, explaining that the women did not speak to the young man or to anyone else as they made their way to the disciples, and that the passage perhaps continued *καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν τοῖς μαθηταῖς περὶ πάντων τούτων*.
139. Aland, art.cit. (Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. 34, 1974, p.454), notes that k alters 16:8 in order to add the 'shorter' ending, reading, 'fugerunt, tenebat enim illas tremor et pavor propter timorem' with the omission of 'and they said nothing to anyone'. Attempts to discover the lost ending are unconvincing, cf. Eta Linnemann, 'Der (wiedergefundene) Markusschluss' (ZThK 66, 1969, pp.255-

---

\* Trocmé, op.cit. pp.51-54, E.T. pp.63-68, argues that the tradition contained no account of resurrection appearances.



## CHAPTER III

- 287), K. Aland, 'Der wiedergefundene Markusschluss? Eine methodologische Bemerkung zur textkritischen Arbeit' (ZThK 67, 1970, pp.3-13), H.-W. Bartsch, 'Der Schluss des Markus-Evangeliums' (ThZ 27, 1971, pp.241-254), W. Schmithals, 'Der Markusschluss, die Verklärungsgeschichte und die Aussendung der Zwölf' (ZThK 69, 1972, pp.379-411).
140. For which both Matthew and Luke substitute 'on the third day', Mk 8:31/Mt 16:21/Lk 9:22; Mk 9:31/Mt 17:23/(Lk 9:44 abbreviates); Mk 10:34/Mt 20:19/Lk 18:33.
141. Mt 16:21; 17:23; 20:19; Lk 9:22; 24:7, 46; Acts 10:40; cf. Mt 27:64 ἕως τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας ; Lk 18:33 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ; 24:21 τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἔχει ; 1 Cor 15:4 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ . Cf. also the reported promise of Jesus to build the temple made without hands διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν (Mk 14:58/Mt 26:61; Mk 15:29/Mt 27:40; Jn 2:19).
142. F. Field, Notes on the Translation of the New Testament, Cambridge, 1899, pp.11-13.
143. Taylor, Mark p.378, Evans, op.cit. pp.47-48; Cranfield, Mark p.278, denies that Field has shown that the two phrases are synonymous.
144. E.g. Taylor, Mark loc.cit., Cranfield, Mark pp.278-279.
145. Nineham, Mark pp.229-230. Evans, op.cit. p.49, suggests that it is 'a probably late, and entirely ad hoc application in Matthew's version of the saying about "the sign of Jonah"'.
146. Cf. Evans, op.cit. pp.47-50, Hahn, op.cit. pp.37-42, 53 n.151 (considerably abbreviated from the German p.49 A.3), 216 n.352, Tödt, op.cit. pp.180-186, J. Schreiber, op.cit. pp.103-119, B. Lindars, New Testament Apologetic, London, 1961, pp.59-72, N. Walker, 'After three days' (NovT 4, 1960, pp.261-262), who suggests that the phrase = the fourth day after the rejection, not after the killing, H.K. McArthur, 'On the third day' (NTS 18, 1971, pp.81-86), E. Best, art.cit. (Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. 34, 1974, p.27), who holds the phrase to be pre-Markan.
147. Since 'as he said unto you' appears to refer back to 14:28, the two sayings must be treated closely together.
148. So e.g. Taylor, Mark pp.549, 608, Cranfield, Mark pp.429, 467-468, Nineham, Mark p.446, R.H. Stein, 'A short note on Mk 14:28 and 16:7' (NTS 20, 1973/4, pp.445-452), G. O'Collins, The Easter Jesus, London, 1973, pp.37-38, arguing against Marxsen.
149. On the meaning of προσγεῖν cf. C.F. Evans, 'I will go before you into Galilee' (JTS ns 5, 1954, pp.9-10).
150. History of Primitive Christianity I, London, 1937, pp.14-18, 'I will place myself at your head and lead you to Galilee - there will come the fulfilment of our hopes - the kingdom of God'. Nineham, Mark p.446, says that this should not be dismissed too lightly as the meaning of the saying by Jesus or in the early Christian community.
151. Mark pp.312, 355-356, Marxsen. op.cit. pp.83-94, cf. pp.111-116, idem The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, London, 1970, pp.163-164, where the interpretation is put forward more tentatively, L. Gaston, op.cit. p.482.



## CHAPTER III

152. Art.cit. (JTS ns 5, 1954, pp.3-18).
153. The verse is absent from the Fayyum fragment (text in Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, op.cit. vol.V p.12, with a brief discussion). Bultmann, HST pp.266-267, holds it to be secondary, either inserted by Mark or a later addition to the gospel. Cranfield, Mark p.429, accepts it as authentic without discussion. In view of the extreme uncertainty about the Fayyum papyrus there seems no reason to doubt that the verse belongs to Mark's gospel and it can therefore be used for a reconstruction of his thought. On the verse cf. Montefiore, Mark p.334, Lohmeyer, Mark pp.311-312, Taylor, Mark p.549, Schweizer, Mark pp.306-308, Grundmann, Mark pp.288-289, Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist, p.76 n.84.
154. Marxsen makes too great a distinction between redactional insertions by Mark and the completed narrative. Clearly if Mark felt the need to insert material into the tradition which he received it was of considerable importance to him, but this differs only in degree from the importance which he attached to the tradition which he reproduced. On the two verses cf. also R.H. Lightfoot, Gospel Message pp.106-116.
155. It is to put too great a stress on the symbolism to remove all geographical meaning from 'Galilee' and interpret it solely as the gentile mission. This also tells against the view of Best that 'Galilee is a theological term in Mark and denotes the place where the gospel is preached (op.cit. p.174, cf. 175). He thinks that the reference is to the resurrection (ibid. pp.175-177, cf. p.92.) C.F.D. Moule, ed., The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ, London, 1968, pp.4-5, has argued that it is possible to accept both Jerusalem and Galilaean traditions as historical. Even if Mt 28:16-20 is a 'stupendous Christophany' (so Evans, art.cit. (JTS ns 5, 1954, p.12)), it is treated in the framework of the chapter as a resurrection appearance. 'Where Jesus had appointed them' (v.16) seems to refer back to v.10, which secures for v.7 (the saying which Matthew has taken over from Mk 16:7 with some alterations) the meaning that Jesus is going to precede the disciples into Galilee and there will appear to them.
156. Best, op.cit. p.174, argues against Evans on this ground.
157. No such 'flight' is related in the gospel as we have it, as Marxsen shows ( op.cit. pp.81-82, where the literature is cited).
158. E.g. Klostermann, Mark p.100, Branscomb, Mark p.163, Taylor, Mark p.393, Cranfield, Mark pp.96-97.
159. Mark p.39.
160. Cf. supra pp.89, 107.
161. Cf. n.21 supra.
162. Op.cit. pp.24, 53, 59, 67. Cf. Rohde, op.cit. pp.142-147.
163. Op.cit. pp.10-23, 190-191. With respect to the second problem Best notes that this cannot be evaded by holding that the victory of Christ in the Cross and Resurrection or in the Transfiguration was a personal victory belonging to him alone,



## CHAPTER III

- since the New Testament lays too much stress upon the Resurrection as a triumph for mankind as well as for Christ, and that the problem remains even if, with Robinson, the victory is thought of as being won at the Cross and Resurrection. It arises in every New Testament writing which speaks both of a conclusive victory over Satan and of Christians being assaulted by spiritual forces (Best refers to Rom 8:38-39, Eph 1:20ff., 1 Pet 3:22, Jn 12:31-32; 16:11, 33, 1 Jn 3:8, and 1 Cor 5:5, 2 Cor 2:11, Gal 4:7, 2 Thess 2:3-10, Eph 6:10ff., 1 Pet 5:8-9, 1 Jn 4:3; 5:19, Rev 12:12, though some of these inconsistencies can be resolved by a critical or historical analysis), ibid. pp.182-183.
164. J.M. Robinson, op.cit. pp.31-32, cf. 33-42; E. Best, op.cit. pp.18-20; Robinson, ibid. pp.43-53, esp. p.45; Best, ibid. pp.21-22.
165. Best, ibid. pp.11-15.
166. Ibid. pp.30-33.
167. Ibid. p.10.
168. Op.cit. p.53. Evidence for this assertion is lacking. Probably Robinson would point to the predictions of the Passion, but he seems also to be influenced by the apostolic kerygma in Acts.
169. Ibid. pp.54-67, esp. 59.
170. O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, London, 1951, p.84.
171. Op.cit. p.56.
172. Ibid. pp.60-61.
173. Ibid. pp.62-63, 78-85.
174. Op.cit. pp.64-67.
175. Ibid. pp.88-89, 92.
176. Ibid. pp.162-165, 183.
177. W.J. Bennett, Jr., 'The Herodians in Mark's Gospel' (NovT 17, 1975, pp.9-14) points this out. He adds the further interesting suggestion that if the parable of the wicked husbandmen is taken as an allegory the servant who was wounded in the head (ἐκεφαλίσεν, 12:4) might be intended as a reference to John the Baptist (cf. ἀπεκεφαλίσεν αὐτον, 6:27). The order in which the servants are sent, however, makes this unlikely, for John should have been the last to be sent. Cf. also Best, op.cit. p.76 n.3, who refers to the account of the death of John as 'a minor passion pointing to the greater Passion'.
178. Gospel Message pp.51-54. The parallels which he draws are παραδιδωμι (13:9; 14:53; 15:15), prediction of future events (13:22-23; 14:18-21, 27-31), the coming 'hour' with the call to 'watch' (13:32-33; 14:32-42), the assumption that the Lord of the house will come in the night, the coming of the Son of man, and the events of the night before the Passion (13:26, 35; 14:62).



CHAPTER III

179. R.H. Lightfoot, ibid. pp.55-57. L. Gaston, op.cit. pp.480-481, however, says that in the Markan context the rending of the temple veil refers to the destruction of the whole temple.
180. Cf. the references to Jesus' sorrow and anguish in 14:33-36 and his dereliction in 14:18-21, 27-31, 37-42, 50, 65-72; 15:16-20, 29-32, 33-37, and Lightfoot, op.cit. p.55.
181. Marxsen, op.cit. p.171. L. Gaston, op.cit. pp.468-483, stresses the parallel pattern of suffering and vindication in the death and resurrection of Jesus and in the persecution of the church and the parousia, but he arrives at this by a different route.



## CHAPTER IV

1. Op.cit. pp.134-136. Note 3:29 and 3:35, which Quesnell holds hardly fall into the category although they contain the introductory formula, since the former is a judgement rather than a directive and the latter is more general and is not an exhortation in the context. Curiously Quesnell gives the Greek as 'ἐστὶς ἄν ... , ἐς γὰρ ἄν (ἐάν), etc.', although ἐστὶς ἄν and ἐς γὰρ ἐάν do not occur in his list of sayings, the introductory phrases (with the number of occurrences) being ἐς ἐάν (4), ἐς ἄν (2), ἐς γὰρ ἄν (2 + 3:35), ἐς δ' ἄν (1 + 3:29). See below for the limited number of universal moral directives which Quesnell recognizes outside the central section of the gospel, 8:27 - 10:52.
2. A. Alt, Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts, Leipzig, 1934 = Kleine Schriften I, München, 1959, pp.278-332. Cf. G. Fohrer, Introduction to the Old Testament, E.T. London, 1970, pp.51-73, and the extensive literature cited.
3. He rightly notes that in 12:17, 29-31 the controversy theme is dominant, 12:43-44 is universal moral teaching phrased to fit an individual case, 11:22-24 contains promises to the believer, while the paraenesis in chapter 13 is in the special context of persecution and the expectation of the approaching end.
4. Cf. 3:26, 27; 4:22; 7:3-4 which are introduced by ἐ' or ἐάν but are not moral directives.
5. Op.cit. pp.127-134, 136-139.
6. Ibid. pp.129-133, 142.
7. Ibid. pp.150, 152. Cf. R.H. Lightfoot, Gospel Message, p.114, Nineham, Mark pp.259-260.
8. Op.cit. p.152. The section pp.142-152 should be considered carefully.
9. Ibid. pp.156-176, quotation on p.171.
10. Ibid. pp.190-208, 257-260. The whole book explains this.
11. But cf. G.H. Boobyer, 'The Eucharistic Interpretation of the miracle of the loaves in St. Mark's gospel' (JTS ns 3, 1952, pp.161-171).
12. Op.cit. pp.58, 124-172, 199-200, 204, 229-230.
13. Ibid. pp.13-26, 228.
14. Ibid. pp.27-58.
15. Ibid. pp.75-86, 229.
16. Ibid. pp.87-111, 124-172, 222-226, 229-230.
17. Ibid. pp.173-221, 230.
18. As with Quesnell, it deserves more than the footnote which R.P. Martin devotes to it, op.cit. p.117 n.30.
19. Op.cit. pp.138-139.
20. Op.cit. pp.134-137.
21. 8:34 - 9:1; 9:28-29, 33-50; 10:2-12, 13-16, 17-27, 28-31, 35-45, 46-52.



## CHAPTER IV

22. 1:17; 6:8-11; 7:18-23; 8:14-21, 33, 34-38; 9:1, 29, 33-50; 10:11-16, 23-31, 35-45; 11:22-25; 12:43-44.
23. The call to watchfulness is another example, cf. pp.105-106 supra.
24. Mally, JBC II p.55. Cf. R.S.V. 'fall away', N.E.B. 'fall from your faith'.
25. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich p.760.
26. So Montefiore, Mark p.231, Rawlinson, Mark p.130, Cranfield, Mark p.313, Nineham, Mark p.255, Schmid, Mark p.181, Haenchen, Mark p.328, Grundmann, Mark p.198. Contrast Johnson, Mark p.166, 'cause to fall into sin'.
27. Swete, Mark p.210, Schweizer, Mark pp.198-199, Schmid, Mark pp.182-183, Johnson, Mark p.166.
28. Rawlinson, Mark p.130, Branscomb, Mark pp.173-174, Taylor, Mark p.411, Cranfield, Mark p.314, Nineham, Mark p.255. Grundmann, Mark p.199, stresses the 'radikale Entschlossenheit gegen das eigene, in der Versuchung stehende Ich', but on 9:43 (p.329) says that Mark gives no indication of what he intends by hand, foot and eye.
29. Mark p.166, cf. Mally, JBC II p.33, who suggests that both verb and noun were technical terms to describe the effect of Christ's death upon Israel (see Rom 9:33, 1 Cor 1:23, Gal 5:11). Bacon had earlier suggested that it was a 'technical term for back-sliding as well as unbelief'.
30. Reploh, op.cit. p.126.
31. Ibid. pp.124-139. Reploh rightly links 9:1 closely with 8:38 as referring to the same events.
32. Cf. Schweizer, Mark p.176.
33. So Haenchen, Mark p.297.
34. Bultmann, HST pp.24-25, 149-150, Taylor, Mark pp.403, 406, 408-410, J. Sundwall, Die Zusammensetzung des Markusevangeliums, Acta Academiae Åboensis Humaniora IX.2, Åbo, 1934, pp.60-63, W.L. Knox, op.cit. pp.24-25, F. Neirynk, 'Die Überlieferung der Jesusworte und Mk 9:33-50' (Concilium 2, 1966, pp.774-780 = E.T. Concilium Vol. 10, No. 2, Dec. 1966, pp.33-39), R. Schnackenburg, 'Mk 9:33-50' (Synoptische Studien für Alfred Wikenhauser, München, 1953, pp.184-206) who includes a discussion of the analysis of W. Bussmann, Synoptische Studien I, Halle, 1925, pp.171-172, 215-216.
35. So Bultmann, HST p.149, Taylor, Mark p.403, Nineham, Mark pp.251-253, Reploh, op.cit. pp.140-148.
36. C.H. Turner, A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, ed. C. Gore, H.L. Goudge, A. Guillaume, London, 1928, Part III, p.87, cf. Taylor, Mark p.406.
37. Cranfield, Mark pp.308-309. Similarly Grant, IB 7 p.787, who suggests that the early church and Mark included hospitality and care of orphans.
38. Reploh, op.cit. pp.140-148.



## CHAPTER IV

39. Cf. Rawlinson, Mark p.127 and Nineham, Mark p.252, both of whom reject this interpretation, Nineham with hesitation.
40. Strack-Billerbeck I p.590. Cf. Taylor, Mark pp.405-406, Nineham, Mark p.253, Cranfield, Mark p.309.
41. Cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich pp.576, 577, Rawlinson, Mark pp.127-128, Cranfield, Mark p.309.
42. E.g. Taylor, Mark p.405.
43. Mark p.253, בְּאֵר transliterated gabbēl by a printing error.
44. 'The Markan Parable of the child in the midst' (Exp. 59, 1947/8, pp.14-16), op.cit., 2nd edit., pp.264-268.
45. Op.cit. pp.148-153. The extent of the original pericope has been debated, cf. Bultmann, HST pp.24-25, Taylor, Mark pp.407-408.
46. Cf. n.34 supra. Has the catchword idea been accepted too lightly as providing a sufficient explanation of passages in the gospels and elsewhere? To us catchwords suggest dissociation and there is a tendency to regard it as a purely mechanical method of collecting originally independent sayings, perhaps with the additional value of being an aid to the memory, but did the ancients view it like this? We should ask whether they separated language and logic in this rigid way and consider what possible connexion they found between the sayings. (A basic study is Th. Soiron, Logia Jesu, München, 1916; cf. Bultmann, HST pp.149-150, 325-326, Taylor, Mark pp.408-410, and the extensive use of catchwords by Sundwall, op.cit. and Schnackenburg, art.cit. (Synoptische Studien für Alfred Wikenhauser pp.184-206)).
47. V.40 appears to be a general saying related to Mt 12:30 and attached loosely to v.39 by γάρ, containing a sudden change of person. V.41 introduces a fresh idea and the parallel Mt 10:42 is set in a different context. Whether v.42 is as closely linked in Mark's thought to the preceding section as Reploh supposes is more questionable, although Matthew and Luke do not attach it as tightly to the following verses as the catchword σκανδαλίζειν might suggest. Reploh, op.cit. p.151, has to fall back upon the rather questionable hypothesis that the form of v.41 which came to Mark had ἐκ τῶν μικρῶν (cf. Mt 10:42 and Jeremias, art.cit. (NZW 29, 1930, p.149 A.1) which provided the catchword linking vv.41 and 42.
48. Cf. Montefiore, Mark pp.230-231, Branscomb, Mark pp.171-172, Rawlinson, Mark pp.129-130, Cranfield, Mark pp.312-313, Schweizer, Mark pp.197-198, Minear, Mark pp.99-100.
49. Mark p.254.
50. In the commentaries the main discussions revolve around the oddity of the Greek phrase, the textual variants and the problem of the authenticity of the saying.
51. Matthew has retained this emphasis although he has what appears to be the same saying in a different context at 10:40-42.
52. Reploh, op.cit. pp.151-152, acknowledges this.
53. Cf. pp.128-129. supra.



## CHAPTER IV

54. Op.cit. pp.154-156.
55. The two sayings have been extensively discussed, cf. Taylor, Mark pp.412-415 and most recently J.D.M. Derrett, 'Salted with fire. Studies in Texts: Mk 9:42-50' (Theology, 76, 1973, pp.364-368).
56. Cf. Taylor, Mark p.413. Many commentators see a reference to persecution: Rawlinson, Mark p.131, Branscomb, Mark p.174, Cranfield, Mark p.316, Nineham, Mark p.256, Mally, JBC II p.44, Schmid, Mark p.183, Johnson, Mark p.167 (hesitantly), Schweizer, Mark p.199 (affliction or persecution or the end time or the Holy Spirit), Haenchen, Mark p.332 (fire of judgement). Wellhausen, Mark p.82 and Klostermann, Mark p.97 speak of the fire as purification.
57. Cf. Nineham, Mark p.316.
58. As Taylor, Mark p.414.
59. Cranfield, Mark p.316. The saltiness is probably the rigorist ethic rather than, as Cranfield suggests, 'the gospel, the word of God'. Cf. Schweizer, Mark p.200, 'Have the spirit of being willing to suffer and of resisting the world, but have peace among yourselves', so essentially O. Cullmann, 'Que signifie le sel dans la parabole de Jésus?' (RHPR 37, 1957, pp.36-43), at pp.41-42.
60. Cf. Bultmann HST p.24, Taylor, Mark pp.438-439, 442-443, Cranfield, Mark pp.336-337, Nineham, Mark pp.278-280, Schweizer, Mark pp.218-219, Replöh, op.cit. pp.157-167.
61. On the meaning of the cup and baptism cf. Rawlinson, Mark p.145, Taylor, Mark pp.440-441 (far more than martyrdom is intended; the promise is to have a part in the messianic sufferings), Cranfield, Mark pp.337-339 (distinguishing between Jesus' own suffering for sin in v.38 and the disciples' sufferings in v.39), Nineham, Mark p.284 (suffering linked with the eucharistic cup which might lead to martyrdom), Replöh, op.cit. pp.159-162 (possibly only suffering and oppression in original saying but Mark applies it to discipleship which reaches as far as martyrdom with Jesus).
62. This seems to be the significance of 'in thy glory', cf. 8:38, whether the primary thought concerned thrones (cf. Mt 19:28/Lk 22:30) or the messianic feast (14:25). Cf. Rawlinson, Mark p.144, Taylor, Mark p.440. Nineham, Mark p.283, affirms that we cannot rule out the possibility that the disciples expected Jesus to inaugurate a temporary earthly paradise when he reached Jerusalem, while Cranfield, Mark p.337, makes a clear distinction between the Messiah's rule and the kingdom of God, the former being preliminary to the latter.
63. A distinction between the teaching in vv.35-40 and 41-44 has been noted by Wellhausen, Mark pp.90-91 and others.
64. Taylor, Mark pp.445-446 has a detached note on 10:45, documented up to 1952. Among later discussion cf. J.A. Emerton, 'The Aramaic background of Mk 10:45' (JTS ns 11, 1960, pp.334-335, H.E. Tødt, op.cit. pp.135-138, 202-211, C.K. Barrett, 'The background of Mark 10:45' (New Testament Essays, ed.A.J.B. Higgins, Manchester, 1959, pp.1-18), M.D. Hooker, op.cit. pp.140-147.



## CHAPTER IV

65. Op.cit. pp.156-172.
66. Cf. pp.76-78 supra.
67. Mark pp.201-202.
68. Op.cit. p.173.
69. Op.cit. pp.78-79.
70. The view that adultery was excluded from the argument on the ground that Dt 22:22 dealt with this and that Jesus' teaching corresponded to the exceptive clause in Matthew (so Wellhausen, Mark p.83, Klostermann, Mark p.98, H.G. Wood, Mark (in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, London, 1919, p.693)) is unlikely since the law condemning an adulteress to death was almost certainly obsolete in the time of Jesus and Shammai specifically interpreted Dt 24:1 as referring to adultery (cf. Rawlinson, Mark pp.134-135, Nineham, Mark pp.261-262). Moreover Mark himself must have regarded the prohibition as absolute since his Gentile readers could not be expected to know Jewish disputations.
71. The relation between these verses and the saying in Mt5:32/Lk 16:18 need not detain us. Whether Mk 10:11 is a Q saying or not does not affect the understanding of the part it plays in Mark's completed gospel. Reploh, op.cit. pp.180-185, thinks that 10:11 was a floating saying, originally lacking the Markan ἐπ' αὐτῶν, which Mark added to the previous pericope in order to stress the connexion between the unity of the man and the woman in the divinely instituted marriage and hence the impossibility of divorce. He holds that this radically alters the character of the dispute, since vv.6-9 are no longer simply an answer to the Pharisees who are tempting Jesus but form the basis for the subsequent teaching on divorce. This draws too close a connexion between vv.11-12 and the pericope and fails to grasp the function of the private teaching in Mark, which is to express plainly what has already been taught in 'parables'.
72. Op.cit. pp.77-78.
73. Contrast Reploh, op.cit. p.185, who says that for Mark 'es ist die Unterweisung, die der Gemeinde Massstabe und Orientierung für die Entscheidungen der Gegenwart geben soll'.
74. On this, however, see most recently D.J. Doughty, 'The presence and future of salvation in Corinth' (ZNW 66, 1975, pp.61-90).
75. Cf. Nineham, Mark p.262.
76. So Bultmann, HST p.32, Taylor, Mark pp.422, 424, Cranfield, Mark pp.322, 324, Nineham, Mark p.269, Schweizer, Mark p.206, Haenchen, Mark pp.346-347, Reploh, op.cit. pp.186-189. That Matthew transfers the verse to follow Mt 18:2 is no evidence that it was introduced by Mark here, since Matthew possessed Mark and it is highly improbable that he applied any critical analysis to his sources.
77. Rawlinson, Mark pp.136-137, Taylor, Mark p.423, Schweizer, Mark p.207, Grant, IB 7 p.800, Cf. Branscomb, Mark p.180, Moule, Mark p.79, 'those who know that they are utterly dependent on God, as small children are on their parents', Grundmann, Mark p.207, 'Kinder können abba sagen und sagen es in ihren Gebeten'.



CHAPTER IV

78. Cranfield, Mark p.324, cf. Schniewind, Mark p.101, Schmid, Mark p.189, Haenchen, Mark pp.345-346, 'nur der Kleine, der Demütige, der "Stille im Lande", der sich bescheiden fernhält von dem, was die Welt schätzt und womit sie lockt, nur er wird "in das Gottesreich eingehen"'.
79. Johnson, Mark p.172.
80. Nineham, Mark p.267.
81. Lohmeyer, Mark p.203.
82. Schniewind, Mark pp.101-102, cf. J. Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, London, 1960, idem 'Mk 10:13-16 Parr. und die Übung der Kindertaufe in der Urkirche' (ZNW 40, 1941, pp.243-245), O. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, London, 1950, contrast Schweizer, Mark p.207, Haenchen, Mark p.347.
83. Op.cit. pp.190-191.
- 83a. W.K. Lowther Clarke, New Testament Problems, London, 1929, pp.37-38, 'Whosoever refuses to receive the kingdom when it comes to them in the form of eager boys pressing forward for a blessing', as you have refused, shall not enter therein', C.J. Cadoux, The Historic Mission of Jesus, London, 1941, pp.230-231, F.A. Schilling, 'What means the saying about receiving the kingdom of God as a little child (τιν βασιλειαν του θεου ὡς παιδιον)? Mk 10:15; Lk 18:17' (without reference to Clarke or Cadoux), rejected by Lohmeyer, Mark pp.204-205 and Taylor, Mark p.423.
84. P.78 supra.
85. Cf. Reploh's detailed analysis, op.cit. pp.191-209. By contrast Cranfield, Mark pp.326-327 holds that vv.17-27 is a historical unity which may well derive from Peter.
86. Nineham, Mark p.271, Schmid, Mark p.193. Reploh, op.cit. pp. 201-202, separates vv.28-31 from 17-27 and holds that they deal with the question of reward for a discipleship that involves abandoning family and possessions and throwing in one's lot with the persecuted church, while the earlier section contains Mark's teaching on riches. Although many, including even Cranfield, Mark pp.325-326, feel that there is a break between vv.27 and 28 and a certain change of theme, it will be shown that the passage was conceived by Mark as a unity. Cf. also M. Goguel, 'Avec des persécutions' (RHPR 8, 1928, pp.264-267) who accepts the unity of the passage and regards Jesus' answer in vv.29-30 as ironical, and N. Walter, 'Zur Analyse von Mc 10:17-31' (ZNW 53, 1962, pp.206-218), who sees vv.24b-27 and 28-31 as Markan additions to the original pericope. Gaston, op.cit. p.471, holds both 'with persecutions' and 'and in the age to come eternal life' as glosses and thinks that the saying draws a contrast between the forsaking houses etc. in the present and receiving them a hundredfold in the kingdom of God, a kingdom which is so imminent that it can be said to be 'now, in this time'.
87. Cf. Bultmann, HST p.111, Cranfield, Mark, pp.333-334, Grundmann, Mark p.214. Wellhausen, Mark p.88 and Mally, JBC II p.45, take it as a promise. Some see it simply as expressing God's sovereign and inscrutable judgement, cf. Johnson, Mark p.176, Schweizer. Mark p.215, Haenchen, Mark p.360.



## CHAPTER IV

88. ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν. Aeth read πως δυσκολεῖ ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν βασιλειαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.
89. Op.cit. pp.90-91.
90. So Rawlinson, Mark p.138, Taylor, Mark p.429, Schweizer, Mark pp.212-213, Wilson, Peake 706c, Schmid, Mark p.192, Reploh, op.cit. p.200. Contrast Haenchen, Mark p.355.
91. Cf. Branscomb, Mark p.183, Nineham, Mark p.271.
92. This seems to be the sense rather than that 'the essence of the Christian faith is to put one's trust in God and to rely on him as the sole source of security and well-being' (Nineham, Mark p.271, cf. Cranfield, Mark p.330).
93. Several see here the idea of grace developed by Paul, cf. Lagrange, Mark p.254, Taylor, Mark p.432, Nineham, Mark p.272.
94. Op.cit. pp.207-209. Schmid, Mark p.197 recognizes this, but solves the problem by interpreting the hundredfold reward as heavenly, ending the genuine words of Jesus at 'hundredfold', cf. Gaston (n.86 supra).
95. Mark p.299.
96. So Haenchen, Mark p.319.
97. So most, e.g. Nineham, Mark pp.244-245, Grundmann, Mark p.191.
98. Op.cit. pp.211-221.
99. R.H. Lightfoot, History and Interpretation p.78, saw the incident as a foil to the Transfiguration. Nineham, Mark p.242, suggests that Mark may have seen a connexion between the disciples' failure to understand the truth about Jesus which is so apparent in the preceding stories and their inability to cast out the demon in his name. Many commentators note the parallel with Moses in Ex 32-33.
100. Op.cit. p.221. He mentions J.M. Robinson's study but gives no indication that he subscribes to his theory.
101. Ibid. p.230.
102. Cf. pp.115-121 supra.
103. Cf. 1:21-28, 32-34, 39; 3:11-12; 5:1-20; 7:24-30; 9:14-27. It has often been noted that the sea is addressed like a demon in 4:39. Note also 9:38.
104. Cf. pp.72-74, 116-117, supra.
105. Cf. J.M. Robinson, op.cit. pp.34-35.
106. Swete, Mark p.120, Klostermann, Mark p.59, Lagrange, Mark p.149, Lohmeyer, Mark p.116, Branscomb, Mark p.107, Taylor, Mark p.309, Cranfield, Mark p.207, Schmid, Mark p.121 think that it is simply as redivivus that John is able to work miracles, but this is too limiting. Montefiore, Mark p.152 and Mally, JBC II p.34, assert that the identification presupposes that John had performed miracles. Cf. also Schniewind, Mark p.60 (with hesitation).
107. Cf. Bultmann, HST p.28, Loymeyer, Mark pp.31-33, Taylor, Mark pp.167-168, Haenchen, Mark pp.79-82.



## CHAPTER IV

108. Cf. Jer 16:16, 1 QH 5:7-8. Aristippus apud Diog.Laert. II.67 and Aristaenetus Ep. 2:23 are the usual Greek parallels quoted.
109. Op.cit. pp.27-35, 227.
110. So C.W.F. Smith, 'Fishers of men: footnotes on a gospel figure' (HTR 52, 1959, pp.187-203), cf. J. Mánek, 'Fishers of men' (NovT 2, 1957, pp.138-141).
111. T.W. Manson held that the mission of the disciples is one of the best attested facts in the life of Jesus, since it is found in Mk, Q, M, and L (Sayings of Jesus pp.73-74, accepted by Taylor, Mark p.302 and Cranfield, Mark p.202). This rests upon an outdated confidence in independent written sources possessing links with apostles. Jeremias, Theology I pp.231-232, 236-239, thinks that the original instructions appear to be contained in Mk 6:8-11, Lk 10:4-11 and Mt 10:9-14, and finds here a Markan version and a Logia version. On Mark's possible abbreviation of his source cf. Bultmann, HST p.145, 'Mark seems to give but an excerpt', Taylor, Mark pp.302-306, Grant, IB 7 p.230. Mally, JBC II p.34, sees the traditional material as a unit consisting of (a) the institution of the Twelve (3:13-19, Mt 10:1-4, Lk 6:12-16), (b) the sending out of the disciples (6:7, 12-13, Mt 10:1-4, Lk 9:1-2, 6; 10:1), (c) a discourse of Jesus to the departing missionaries (6:8-11, Mt 10:5-42, Lk 9:3-5; 10:2-16). He thinks that Mark has separated (a) from (b) and drastically abbreviated (c). Replöh, op.cit. pp.52-54 argues that 6:8-11 is derived from a much larger body of material: 6:8-9 is found in a shorter form in Lk 10:4; 6:10 is more complete in Lk 10:5-7 (die Hausmission) to which was originally attached Lk 10:8-9 (die Stadtmission); 6:11 = Lk 10:10-11.
112. Cf. Taylor, Mark pp.304-306, Grundmann, Mark p.122, Haenchen, Mark pp.222-223.
113. Note the permission to carry staff and wear sandals, cf. Rawlinson, Mark p.77, Taylor, Mark p.304, Cranfield, Mark p.199, Nineham, Mark p.169, Schweizer, Mark p.129, Mally, JBC II p.34 (who adds that perhaps Mark deleted the prohibition to go among the Gentiles and the Samaritans).
114. Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, London, 3rd Edit. 1964, pp.356-364, 387-395, earlier, idem The Mystery of the Kingdom of God, London, 1914 (German, 1901).
115. This does not necessarily mean that the eschatological interpretation in itself is wrong. Cf. also more recent writers who have followed A. Schweitzer: Martin Werner, The Formation of Christian Dogma, London, 1957, pp.9ff. (abridged English version of Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas problemgeschichtlich dargestellt, 1941), J.C.G. Greig, 'The Eschatological Ministry' (in The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective. Essays in memory of G.H.C. MacGregor, ed. Hugh Anderson and William Barclay, Oxford, 1965, pp.99-131, esp. pp. 105-108, 115-116). If we are correct in our understanding of Mark the question of Jesus' eschatological view must be reopened.
116. So Branscomb, Mark p.104.



## CHAPTER IV

117. Nineham, Mark p.168, cf. Taylor, Mark p.302, 'Mark has no real appreciation of the immense importance of the event itself in the story of Jesus', and contrast Cranfield, Mark pp.202-203, who argues that Mark knew that this mission was only 'a kind of appendage to Jesus' own preaching' and that for Mark the true preaching belonged to the period after the Ascension.
118. Wellhausen, Mark p.58 (ἄφ' ἑδρών = intestine, cf. D ἐχέρος). Grundmann, Mark p.151, suggests that the phrase might be taken with τὴν κοιλίαν or τὸν ἄφ' ἑδρών and express with biting cynicism the view that the natural functions of the body treat all food alike, cf. Klostermann, Mark p.71, Schweizer, Mark p.149-150.
119. Cf. Kirsopp Lake and H.J. Cadbury, The Beginnings of Christianity IV, p.115, Montefiore, Mark p.175, Rawlinson, Mark p.96, Taylor, Mark pp.344-345, Branscomb, Mark p.128, Cranfield, Mark p.241, Nineham, Mark p.196, Schmid, Mark p.138, Mally, JBC II p.37.
120. Swete, Mark p.152, Lohmeyer, Mark p.142, Haenchen, Mark p.264. M. Black, op.cit. pp.158-159 suggests that Jesus' original Aramaic should have been rendered, 'all the food being cast out and purged away'.
121. Mark p.192.
122. Cf. Bultmann, HST p.17, Klostermann, Mark p.71, Lohmeyer, Mark p.142, Taylor, Mark pp.345-347, Branscomb, Mark p.128, Nineham, Mark p.192, Schmid, Mark p.139, Schweizer, Mark, Haenchen, Mark p.265, Grant, IB 7 p.753, all questioning this. Johnson, Mark p.134, notes that catalogues of vices have often been regarded as hellenistic but parallels are found at Qumran (1QS 4:9-11). Cranfield, Mark pp.242-243, argues that the vocabulary is not closely Pauline and holds that it is no more than a possibility that vv.18b-23 is a Christian interpretation of the saying in v.15.
123. Op.cit. p.43.
124. Wellhausen, Mark p.63, Taylor, Mark pp.134, 367-368, Nineham, Mark pp.214-215, Schweizer, Mark pp.160-161. Branscomb, Mark p.141, holds that it could not have been written until the two stories had been combined into a single narrative. Contrast Cranfield, Mark p.260, who accepts the historicity both of this passage and of the two feeding miracles. Quesnell, op.cit. pp.105-106, rejects the argument of Wellhausen as an illegitimate movement from the literary to the historical point of view and back again, but sets out seven 'valid reasons' for recognizing the passage as redactional. Cf. ibid. pp.2-28 for a useful survey of the literature.
125. Matthew certainly thought it clumsy and unintelligible, for he virtually rewrote the whole pericope, taking the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees (and Sadducees) as the central point and explaining what it symbolized. Cf. Quesnell, op.cit. pp.112-113, G. Barth, 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law' (Bornkamm, Barth and Held, op.cit. p.114). The assertion that the difficulty arises because Mark did not possess footnotes and simply placed an isolated saying where it seemed most appropriate is unsatisfactory because it makes no attempt to explain how Mark understood his completed narrative (cf. C.H. Turner, New



## CHAPTER IV

- Commentary Part III, p.78, Nineham, Mark p.215, contrast Lohmeyer, Mark p.157, Quesnell, op.cit. pp.107-108.
126. Op.cit. pp.75-86.
  127. Op.cit. pp. 232-257.
  128. Quesnell, ibid. pp.229-231, n.56, 270-274, is antagonistic to attempts to discover numerical symbolism.
  129. Mark pp.290-304, Matthew and Mark pp.57-80.
  130. Even Farrer appears to have reservations about it, however, for he concludes his discussion of the Markan pattern of the loaves by wondering whether Mark's meaning is as complicated as this and hinting that perhaps we must be content with an open verdict, though asserting that what is plain is that the true answer has something to do with the extension of the children's bread to the Gentiles (Matthew and Mark p.80).
  131. Cf. D.F. Robinson, 'The parable of the loaves' (AmThR 39, 1957, pp.107-115).
  132. Little definite information about the two types of basket is available, cf. the sceptical note by Quesnell, op.cit. pp.230-231.
  133. Cf. E.D. Johnston, 'The Johannine version of the feeding of the five thousand - an independent tradition?' (NTS 8, 1961/2, pp. 151-154), Eric F.F. Bishop, παρασια and πληρωματα (Exp.T. 60, 1948/9, pp.192-193, incorrectly quoted by Johnston as JTS). It is such an embarrassment to Farrer that he, in the course of his exposition (by what Quesnell, op.cit. p.15, calls a sleight of hand), switches from the number of baskets to the number of loaves.
  134. E.F.F. Bishop, art.cit., suggests this.
  135. Cf. G.H. Boobyer, art.cit. (JTS ns 3, 1952, pp.161-171) and E.D. Johnston, art.cit. (NTS 8, 1961/2, pp.151-154) for arguments against eucharistic connexions.
  136. Cf. Cranfield, Mark p.223, Quesnell, op.cit. pp.229-231, n.56. G.H. Boobyer, 'The miracles of the loaves and the Gentiles in St. Mark's gospel' (SJT 6, 1953, pp.77-87), argues that both crowds are Gentiles. Farrer's second attempt at an explanation concludes that both are Jews (Matthew and Mark, p.67).
  137. On the identity of the Ἑλληνισται cf. Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich p.251, Kirsopp Lake and H.J. Cadbury, The Beginnings of Christianity IV p.64, H.J. Cadbury, 'The Hellenists' (Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity V pp.59-74, E.C. Blackman, 'The Hellenists of Acts 6:1' (Exp.T. 48, 1936/7, pp.524-525). It is not suggested that Mark knew Acts or had any direct contact with the traditions found there, nor does this imply acceptance of Trocmé's theory that Mark 1-13 was written by a member of the Seven (op.cit. pp.195ff., E.T. pp.248-259).
  138. Farrer, Matthew and Mark pp.70-73, thinks that there was a loaf in the boat which the disciples had not brought with them. Klostermann, Mark p.77, and Grundmann, Mark p.162, accept the view of J. Weiss that Mark may have meant the phrase in a 'geistlich-symbolisch' sense, pointing to Jesus as the Bread of life. So also Mally, JBC II p.39.  
Mt 22:16 is dependent on Mk 12:13. Josephus is the only literary



## CHAPTER IV

- source to mention 'partisans of Herod' (as τοὺς τὰ 'Ηρώδου φερεομένους Ant 14:450). On the Herodians cf. B.W. Bacon, 'Pharisees and Herodians in Mark' (JBL 39, 1920, pp.102-112), idem The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date, New Haven and London, 1925, pp.74-76, E. Bickerman, 'Les Hérodiens' (RB 47, 1938, pp. 184-197), P. Joüon, 'Les "Hérodiens" de l'Évangile' (RScRel 28, 1938, pp.585-588), H.H. Rowley, 'The Herodians in the Gospels' (JTS 41, 1940, pp.14-27, S. Sandmel, 'Herodians' (IDB II pp.594-595), H.W. Hoehner, Herod Antipas, Cambridge, 1972, Appendix X, W.J. Bennett Jr., art.cit. (NovT 17, 1975, pp.9-14).
140. So Lohmeyer, Mark pp.157-158, Schmid, Mark p.150, Mally, JBC II pp.39-40, Boobyer, art.cit. (JTS ns 3, 1952, p.171), idem art.cit. (SJT 6, 1953, pp.85-86). Other interpretations are: hypocrisy (as Lk 12:1), Schniewind, Mark p.78; their persecution of Jesus and the disciples, Wellhausen, Mark p.64, Rawlinson, Mark pp.106-107, Haenchen, Mark p.288; their hardness of heart, Gnileke, op.cit. pp.36-38.
141. Bultmann, HST p.218, Taylor, Mark p.458.
142. Bultmann, HST pp.32-33, Taylor, Mark p.496.
143. Reploh, op.cit. p.219, Quesnell, op.cit. p.151.
144. Even if the link is the catchword  $\chi\eta\rho\alpha$  (Sundwall, op.cit. p.76), this does not mean that Mark saw only a mechanical connexion between the pericopae. Grundmann, Mark p.257, notes the catchword but also sees an inner connexion.
145. Lohmeyer, Mark pp.266-267, Schniewind, Mark p.131. Houlden, op.cit. pp.43-44, makes a similar point, 'What renders the widow's mite so commendable is not her mere generosity but her self-abandonment in God's cause'.
146. E.g. by Haenchen, Mark p.433.
147. Mysterious Revelation pp.121-122. Cf. also Nineham, Mark pp.288-289, Schweizer, Mark pp.235-236.
148. Rawlinson, Mark p.154, Taylor, Mark p.460, Branscomb, Mark p.201, Schmid, Mark p.208, Grundmann, Mark p.229. So also, with possible alternative as a marginal gloss, Lohmeyer, Mark p.234, Schweizer, Mark p.232, Nineham, Mark p.303, Haenchen, Mark p.380.
149. T.W. Manson, 'The cleansing of the Temple' (BJRL 33, 1951, pp. 271-282), 'a tale of miraculous power wasted in the service of ill-temper'. But cf. E.F.F. Bishop, 'Around the fig-tree' (Exp.T. 48, 1936/7, pp.429-430) who describes a fig-tree in Jerusalem bearing edible figs on Good Friday, 1936.
150. Contrast Montefiore, Mark p.273.
151. Cf. Chapter III n.114, pp.211-212 supra.
152. Acts 2:43; 3:1-10; 5:1-11, 12-16; 6:8; 8:13, 39; 9:36-42; 12:6-11; 13:6-12; 14:8-9; 16:25-26; 19:11-12; 20:7-12; 28:3-6.
153.  $\Sigma B L W \Delta \psi$  565 700 892  $g^2$  k l  $r^2$  syr<sup>s</sup> sa bo geo arm. Cf. Nineham, Mark p.305.
154. The verse contains the only instance of ἀφέναι with the sense of forgiving other men, it contains the phrase ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς which is unique in Mark, it recalls the Lord's



CHAPTER IV

Prayer and it is found in this exact form in Mt 6:14 and 7:11. The last two references make it unlikely that this phrase is evidence that Mark knew the Lord's Prayer as Taylor, Mark p.467, claims, contrast Nineham, Mark p.305.



## CHAPTER V

1. Bultmann, HST pp.347-348. Cf. Marxsen, op.cit. p.216, 'Mark ties together the two "strands" of primitive Christian preaching, the Pauline kerygma and the (so-called) synoptic tradition'. Cf. Ph. Vielhauer, 'Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums' (in Zeit und Geschichte, Bultmann Festschrift, ed. D. Dinkler, Tübingen, 1964, pp.155-169), J. Schreiber, 'Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums. Beobachtungen zur Theologie und Komposition des Zweites Evangeliums' (ZThK 58, 1961, pp.154-183).
2. Marxsen, loc.cit., R.P. Martin, op.cit. pp.156-162, 214-225, idem, 'A gospel in search of a life-setting' (Exp.T. 80, 1968/9, pp.361-364).
3. Rohde, op.cit. p.139, Pesch, op.cit. pp.145-146, R.P. Martin, op.cit. p.73, H. Conzelmann, op.cit. p.144.
4. Both letters are accepted as Pauline and as having been written in the traditional order. They are dated soon after A.D. 50. Cf. E. Best, The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, London, 1972, pp.7-59.
5. E.g. the term  $\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\epsilon\iota\alpha$  (1 Thess 2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23; 2 Thess 2:1, 8) occurs only in Mt 24:3, 27, 37, 39 in the gospels; 1 Thess 2:15-16 appears to be based on the same traditional material as Mt 23:29-38.
6. Cf. Best, op.cit. pp.152-153.
7. Ibid. p.275, 'It may well have been an accepted apocalyptic term but it goes too far to say that Paul reflects here a saying of Jesus'.
8. If Loevestan, op.cit. pp.34-35, 56, cited by Best, op.cit. p.212, is correct in holding that sleep and drunkenness are metaphors for absorption in the affairs of the present world, this would accord with Mark's warning against 'the cares of the world and the deceitfulness of riches and the lusts of other things'.
9. Cf. Best, op.cit. p.278.
10. Ibid. p.289. O.Cullmann, Christ and Time pp.164-166, holds that  $\tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\omicron\nu$  was the Christian preaching and this would provide a further link between 2 Thess 2:6 and Mk 13:10, but the exegesis is improbable, cf. Best, op.cit. p.297.
11. Ibid. p.293.
12. Cf. n.15 infra.
13. The decisive study is M. Werner, Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium (BZNW 1, Giessen, 1923), who gives details of the development of the theory by Volkmar, Holsten and Schulze, and decisively rejects Pauline influence on the grounds of thought and vocabulary. Among those who accept that Mark was influenced by Paul are A. Loisy, Les Évangiles Synoptiques I, Paris, 1907, p.116, Montefiore, Mark pp.xxxi-xxxiii, and B.W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark pp.221-271. Lagrange, Mark pp.cxl-cl, and Taylor, Mark p.125-129, contain careful discussions of the question. The more recent theories that Mark combined the Pauline kerygma with the historical tradition (e.g. Bultmann and Marxsen, cf. n.1 supra) are essentially reformul-



## CHAPTER V

ations of the theory, as Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, London, 1966, p.68, notes. Both Bultmann and Marxsen state that Werner's conclusions are vitiated because he failed to distinguish between Mark's own writing and the tradition. Cf. R.P. Martin, op.cit. pp.156-162, 214-217, 222 and J.C. Fenton, 'Paul and Mark' (in Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955, pp.89-112, which probably deserves the strictures of Trocmé, op.cit. E.T. pp.144-146).

15. Werner points out that Mark says ὁ καιρὸς πεπληρώται (1:15) while Paul speaks of the πληρωμὴ τοῦ χρόνου (Gal 4:4), Paul uses αἶων and κόσμος promiscue, while Mark uses αἶων always in a temporal sense and never uses κόσμος in the pregnant sense (op.cit. pp.145-146). Mark does not use παρουσία, and although he describes the event his account is not based upon 1 Thess (ibid. pp.152-153). Apart from 2 Thess, which Werner does not accept as Pauline, Paul does not set out the signs of the coming of the end and his expectation of the imminent end seen in 1 Thess 4:15; 1 Cor 15:21; Rom 13:11, 12; 1 Cor 7:29, 31; 10:11; Phil 4:5 depends upon the fact of the earthly life of Jesus and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and not on the signs of its coming (ibid. pp.147-148). Similarly, while Mk 13 sees the predicted woes as a sign of the nearness of the end, Paul argues from his certainty that Christ will soon come that the woes will break out (ibid. p.151). Werner further denies that the use of ἀποστασι (Mk 13:7; 2 Thess 2:2) and σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα (Mk 13:22; 2 Thess 2:9) is sufficient evidence that Mark is dependent even on 2 Thess (ibid. pp.151-152). He claims that both Mark and Paul expect a resurrection, but Mark speaks of a general resurrection at the time of the parousia (Mk 13:27; cf. 8:38; 9:45, 47), while Paul holds that only Christians rise at the return of Christ (1 Thess 4:16; 1 Cor 15:23) and that the general resurrection comes at the end (1 Cor 15:24-26) (ibid. pp.153-161). Despite some uncertainty about Paul's precise teaching on judgement, Werner claims that Mark was not influenced by Paul. Paul teaches that there will be two acts of judgement, the first on the day of the parousia when Christ is the judge and the judgement is limited to Christians, the second after the messianic age when God effects the judgement of all mankind and the angels. Mark envisages only a general final judgement at the parousia with the Son of man as judge of all men but not of the angels. Moreover, Mark depicts the fate of the condemned as gehenna, an idea foreign to Paul (ibid. pp.161-169). Thus Werner concludes that Mark and Paul show so many important differences that there can be no question of Pauline influence on Mark (ibid. p.177). It must be acknowledged that Werner's general conclusions are correct:

'1. Wo Markus mit Paulus übereinstimmt, handelt es sich immer um allgemein-urchristliche Anschauungen.

2. Wo in den Briefen über diese gemeinsame Basis hinaus besondere, charakteristisch paulinische Anschauungen zutage treten, da fehlen entweder bei Markus die Parallelen vollständig, oder Markus vertritt geradezu entgegengesetzte Standpunkte.

3. Von einem Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium kann daher nicht im geringsten die Rede sein.'

We, however, are not here concerned with direct influence but with the relative position of Paul, Mark, and the two later evangelists.



More recently R.H. Shaw, 'A conjecture on the signs of the end' (ATHR 47, 1965, pp.96-102), has argued that, although 2 Thess does not contradict Mk 13, it shows little or no familiarity with it and there is no direct connexion between the two. He holds that the schema of 2 Thess 2 is merely a hasty baptism with the name of Christ of the common eschatological expectation of the Jews since the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. This, however, treats Jewish eschatologies as more uniform than they were.

16. Note also the Matthaean addition of  $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  in Mt 9:11; 17:24; 23:8, and the single retention of Rabbi in Mt 26:49. G. Barth, art.cit. (Bornkamm, Barth and Held, op.cit. pp.100, 102), notes the alterations which Matthew makes in the pericope about the true relatives of Jesus (Mk 3:31-35/Mt 12:46-50). In Mark Jesus looks round on the crowd, in Matthew he stretches out his hand towards his disciples and says that they are his brethren 'for whosoever shall do the will of my Father ...' Barth comments that the will of God is actually done in discipleship, and suggests, not necessarily correctly, that Matthew sees the church embodied in the disciples who are treated as a group over against the people (= Judaism).
17. Cf. chap. II, pp. 65, 70, 77, 198 n.117, 199, n.128. Further examples of the way Matthew increases the didactic motive are discussed in G. Bornkamm, 'End-expectation and church in Matthew' (in Bornkamm, Barth and Held, op.cit. pp.31, 35) and G. Barth (ibid. pp.81-83). G.D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, Oxford, 1946, p.116, had much earlier suggested that all of Matthew's references to the Sabbath are concerned with how rigidly it should be kept.
18. Matthew's alterations of Mk 4:10-12/Mt 13:10-15 are instructive.  $\tau\alpha \mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha \tau\eta\varsigma \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\varsigma$  are now doctrines. The disciples are those who are given knowledge and will be granted still more (Matthew transfers Mk 4:25 to follow Mk 4:11), the inability of the crowds to understand is a fact, not the result of the parabolic teaching ( $\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  for  $\epsilon\nu\alpha$ , Mt 13:13). Therefore, the disciples do not ask the meaning of the parable but why Jesus speaks to the crowds in parables. G. Barth, art.cit. (Bornkamm, Barth and Held, op.cit. pp.105-112), however, exaggerates the disciples' ability to understand and the obduracy of the crowd. Cf. Gnilya, op.cit. pp.89-115.
19. Cf. Gnilya, ibid. p.110.
20. Cf. H. Conzelmann, op.cit. p.190.
21. So Bornkamm, art.cit. (Bornkamm, Barth and Held, op.cit. p.16), G. Barth, art.cit. (ibid. p.60).
22. So Jeremias, The Sermon on the Mount, London, 1961, although he is primarily concerned with the teaching of Jesus himself.
23. So Bornkamm, art.cit. (Bornkamm, Barth and Held, op.cit. p.31), Barth, art.cit. (ibid. pp.76-85). Note, however, Barth's caution about speaking of Jesus' teaching as a nova lex, pp.157-158.
24. Note the alterations in Mk 13:10 and its transposition to precede immediately the prediction of the abomination of desolation. Cf. Bornkamm, art.cit. (Bornkamm, Barth and Held, op.cit. pp.23,



- 42). Barth also claims that the exhortations to watchfulness in Mt 24:42 and 25:13 are understood by Matthew as exhortations to do God's will. If this is correct it would support the present interpretation of Matthew's view of the parousia and the period before it. Jerenias, Parables pp.48-63, sees the delay as one of the major influences in modifying the parables.
25. Cf. Marxsen, op.cit. pp.117-150, esp. pp.138-146, 150 n.106.
  26. H. Conzelmann, op.cit. and the studies discussed in J. Rohde, op.cit.
  27. Lk 4:15; 5:3, 17; 6:6; 11:1(bis); 12:12; 13:10, 22, 26; 19:47; 20:1, 21; 21:37; 23:5.
  28. E.g. the teaching about the end is given to all the disciples, not just the four (Mk 13:3/Mt 24:3).
  29. The fact that the seventy are also sent out on a mission also alters the unique position of the Twelve.
  30. E. Trocmé, Jesus and his Contemporaries, London, 1973, pp.90-92. Note Lk 7:36-37; 10:38-42; 11:37-41; 14:1, 7, 12, 15; 19:1-10.
  31. E. Trocmé, ibid. p.81, points out that the tone of these Lukan parables in general is that of moral exhortation. Cf. J. Gnille, op.cit. p.188.
  32. Cf. B.W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark: its Composition and Date, pp.54-63, discussing the theory of C.C. Torrey.
  33. The apocalypse of John was produced in this kind of atmosphere and is a strikingly different composition from Mark.
  34. The exact nature of the false teaching is disputed, cf. Best, op.cit. pp.275-278.
  35. So A.L. Moore, op.cit.
  36. So Cranfield, art.cit.(SJT 7, 1954, pp.285-290), idem Mark p.408.
  37. So G.E. Ladd, op.cit.
  38. Cf. Best, op.cit. p.276.
  39. J.T. Sanders, Ethics in the New Testament, London, 1975, appeared after this typescript was completed. After surveying the course of the study of Jesus, Sanders concludes: 'His ethical teaching is interwoven with an imminent eschatology to such a degree that every attempt to separate the two and to draw out only the ethical thread invariably and inevitably draws out also strands of the eschatology so that both yarns only lie in a heap' (p.29). He does not, however, present any clear programme for recovering the authentic teaching of Jesus and there is little discussion of the gospel material. His conclusions about Mark are similar to those presented here. 'Primarily the Markan ethics is one of discipleship', and following Jesus means to suffer with him (p.32). The instructions to 'watch' and 'wait' have great significance, for Mark's imminent eschatology is the basis of his whole outlook (p.33). 'Mark's ethics is determined by his view that the Christian is a defenceless person awaiting his Lord in a hostile world', and Christians simply draw together against the world and in anticipation of the Lord's coming. The discussion, however, is extremely brief and little evidence or argument is offered.



TABLE I ῥαββι and διδασκαλος

(a) ῥαββι . ῥαββιου

<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	
9:5	17:4 κυριε	9:33 ἐπιστατα	Peter at Transfiguration
10:51	20:33 κυριε	18:41 κυριε	Bartimaeus
11:21	21:20 omits	-	Peter at withered fig tree
14:45	<u>26:49</u>	omits	Judas in Gethsemene

(b) διδασκαλος (\*) = vocative)

<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	
4:38*	8:25 κυριε	8:24 ἐπιστατα	Disciples - stilling storm
5:35	omits	<u>8:49</u>	Jairus' servants
9:17*	17:15 κυριε	<u>9:38</u>	Father of epileptic boy
9:38*	-	9:49 ἐπιστατα	John - strange exorcist
10:17*	<u>19:16</u>	<u>18:18</u>	Rich man
10:20*	omits	omits	idem.
10:35*	omits	-	Sons of Zebedee
12:14*	<u>22:16</u>	<u>20:21</u>	Pharisees - tribute money
12:19*	<u>22:24</u>	<u>20:28</u>	Sadducees' question
12:32*	omits ( <u>22:36</u> )	omits ( <u>20:39</u> )	Scribe - great commandment
13:1*	omits	omits ( <u>21:7</u> )	One of disciples
14:14	<u>26:18</u>	<u>22:11</u>	Jesus - preparation for Passover

Note

ῥαββι Mt 26:25 Judas at Last Supper (cf. 23:7, 8)

διδασκαλος

- Matthew: (i) Added to Mk - 9:11 (Mk 2:16), cf. 22:36\*  
(ii) Other pericopae - 8:19\*/Lk 9:57 omits; 12:38\*(cf. Lk 11:29)  
17:24; (10:24-25/cf. Lk 6:40; 23:8)
- Luke: (i) Added to Mk - 10:25\* (Mk 12:28), cf. 21:7\*  
(ii) Other pericopae - 7:40\*; 11:45\*; 12:13\*; 19:39\*;  
(3:12\*; 6:40)



## (a) διδάσκω

<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Occasion</u>	<u>Audience</u>
1:21	-	<u>4:31</u>	Capernaum synagogue	synagogue
1:22	( <u>7:29</u> )	(4:32) λέγει	With authority	synagogue
2:13	(9:9 omits)	(5:27 omits)	Call of Levi	πρὸς ἓ ὄχλος
4:1	(13:1)	(8:4 omits)	By lake	ὄχλος πλείετος
4:2	(13:3) ἐλάλησεν	(8:4) εἶπεν	In parables	ὄχλος πλείετος
6:2	<u>13:54</u>	(4:16-30)	Synagogue in πατρίς	synagogue
6:6	<u>9:35</u>	(9:1 omits)	In villages	villages
6:34	(14:14)	(9:11) ἐλάλει	Feeding 5000	πολύς ὄχλος
8:31	(16:21) δείκνυσεν	(9:22) εἶπεν	Prediction of Passion I	μαθηταί
9:31	(17:22) εἶπεν	(9:43) εἶπεν	Prediction of Passion II	μαθηταί
10:1	(19:1-2)	-	As his custom was	ὄχλοι
11:17	(21:13) λέγει	(19:46, 47) λέγων	Cleansing temple	ὄχλος αὐτοῦ
12:14	<u>22:16</u>	<u>20:21</u>	Said <u>by</u> Pharisees	-
12:35	(22:41) ἐπηρώτησεν	(20:41) εἶπεν	David's son	ὁ πάλιν ὄχλος
14:49	<u>26:55</u>	(22:53 omits)	'Daily in temple'	-
6:30	-	(9:10 omits)	<u>By</u> Twelve on return	
7:7	<u>15:9</u>	-	Is 29:13	

## (b) διδάχη

<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Occasion</u>	<u>Audience</u>
1:22	( <u>7:28</u> )	<u>4:32</u>	Synagogue in Capernaum	synagogue
1:27	-	(4:26) λέγει	New teaching	πάντες
4:2	(13:3 omits)	(8:4 omits)	Said 'in his teaching'	ὄχλος
11:18	(cf. <u>22:33</u> )	(19:47-8)	Crowd astonished	ὄχλος
12:38	(23:1)	(20:45)	Against scribes	ὄχλος



TABLE III THE LOGIA

<u>No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Rodd</u>	<u>Audience</u>		<u>In Lk</u>
					<u>Baird</u>	<u>In Mt</u>	
1	1:15	4:17	cf.4:15	(C)	AA	(C)	
2	1:17	4:19	cf.5:10	(XII)	AD	(XII)	
3	1:25		4:35	M	ADG		M
4	1:38		4:43	(XII)	AD		C
5	1:41	8:3	5:13	M	ADG	M	M
6	1:44	8:4	5:14	M	ADG	M	M
7	2:5	9:2	5:20	M	ADG	M	M
8	2:8-10	9:4-6b	5:23	S		S	SPh
9	2:11	9:6b	5:24	M		M	M
10	2:17	9:12-13	5:31-32	SofPh	AO	Ph	PhS
11	2:19-20	9:15	5:34-35	S(?)	AO	(1)	PhS
12	2:21	9:16	5:36	S(?)	AO	(1)	PhS
13	2:22	9:17	5:37-8	S(?)	AO	(1)	PhS
14	2:25-6	12:3-4	6:3-5	Ph	AO	Ph	Ph
15	2:27			Ph	AO		
16	2:28	12:8	6:5	Ph	AO	Ph	Ph
17	3:3		6:8	M			M
18	3:4	cf.12:12	6:9	Ph	AO	(2)	SPh
19	3:5	12:13	6:10	M		M	M
20	3:23-26	12:25-8	11:17-20	S	AO	Ph	C
21	3:27	12:29	11:21	S	AO	Ph	C
22	3:28-9	12:31-2	12:10	S	AO	Ph	(C)D
23	3:33	12:48		C	ADG	(3)	
24	3:34-5	12:49-50	8:21	C	ADG	C(?)	C
25	4:3-8	13:3-8	8:5-8a	C	AI	C	C
26	4:9	13:9	8:8b	C	AI	C	C
27	4:11-12	13:11.13	8:10	XIID	AI	D	D
28	4:13-20	13:18-23	8:11-15	XIID	AI	D	D
29	4:21		8:16	(C)	AI		D
30	4:22		8:17	(C)	AI		D
31	4:23			(C)			
32	4:24a		8:18a	(C)	AI		D

(1) disciples of John

(2) 'they' (? Ph)

(3) him that told him



<u>No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Rodd</u>	<u>Baird</u>	<u>In Mt</u>	<u>In Lk</u>
33	4:24b			(C)	AI		
34	4:25	13:12	8:18b	(C)	AI	D	D
35	4:26-9			(C)	AI		
36	4:30-2	13:31-2	13:18-9	(C)	AI	(C)	C
37	4:35	(8:18)	8:22	M(XII)			D
38	4:39	(8:26b)	(8:24)	M			
39	4:30	8:26a	8:25	M		M	M
40	5:8		(8:29	M			
41	5:9		8:30	M			M
42	5:19		8:39	M			M
43	5:30		8:45	M			M
44	5:34	9:22	8:48	M		M	M
45	5:36		8:50	M			M
46	5:39	9:24	8:52	M		M	M
47	5:41		8:54	M			M
48	6:4	13:57		C	AGO	C	
49	6:8-9	10:9-10	9:3	XII	AD	XII	XII
50	6:10-11	10:11.14	9:4-5	XII	AD	XII	XII
51	6:31			XII	AI		
52	6:37	14:16	9:13	(M) XII	AI	D	XII
53	6:38			(M) XII	AI	D	
54	6:50	14:27		(M) XII	AD		
55	7:6-8	15:7-9		PhS	AO	PhS	
56	7:9-13	15:3-6		PhS	AO	PhS	
57	7:14-15	15:10-11		C	ADG	C	
58	7:(16)			C			
59	7:18-9	15:16-7		XII	AD	D	
60	7:20-23	15:18-20		XII	AD	D	
61	7:27	15:26		(M) (1)	ADG	(1)	
62	7:29	15:28		(M) (1)	ADG	(1)	
63	7:34			M	ADG		
64	8:2-3	15:32		(M) XII	AI	D	
65	8:5	15:34		(M) XII	AI	D	
66	8:12	(16:4 12:39	11:29	Ph	AO	PhS	C
67	8:15	16:6	12:1	XII	AD	D	(C)D

---

(1) Syro-Phoenician woman



<u>No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Rodd</u>	<u>Baird</u>	<u>In Mt</u>	<u>In Lk</u>
68	8:17-21	16:8-11		XII	AD	D	
69	8:23			M	ADG		
70	8:26			M	ADG		
71	8:27	16:13	9:18	XII	AD	D	D
72	8:29	16:15	9:20	XII	AD	D	D
73	8:31	16:21	9:22	XII		D	D
74	8:33	16:23		(1)	AD	(1)	
75	8:34	16:24	9:23	C+D	AI	D	(2)
76	8:35	16:25	9:24	C+D	AI	D	(2)
77	8:36	16:26a	9:25	C+D	AI	D	(2)
78	8:37	16:26b		C+D	AI	D	
79	8:38	cf. 16:27	9:26	C+D	AI	D	(2)
80	9:1	16:28	9:27	C+D	AI	D	(2)
81	9:9	17:9		(3)	AD	(3)	
82	9:12-13	17:11-12		(3)	AD	(3)	
83	9:16			M	AI		
84	9:19	17:17	9:41	M	AI	M	M
85	9:21			M	AI		
86	9:23			M	AI		
87	9:25			M	AI		
88	9:29	17:(21)		XII	AI	(D)	
89	9:31	17:22-3	9:44	XII	AD	D	D
90	9:33			XII			
91	9:35		9:48b	XII	AD		D
92	9:37	18:5	9:48a	XII	AD	D	D
93	9:39		9:50a	(4)	AD		(4)
94	9:40		9:50b	(4)	AD		(4)
95	9:41			(4)	AD		
96	9:42	18:6	(17:1-2)	(4)	AD	D	
97	9:43	18:8		(4)	AD	D	
98	9:45			(4)	AD		
99	9:47	18:9		(4)	AD	D	
100	9:44,46,48			(4)	AD		

(1) Peter

(2) 'all'

(3) Peter, James and John

(4) in context John (?XII)



<u>No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Rodd</u>	<u>Baird</u>	<u>In Mt</u>	<u>In Lk</u>
101	9:49a			(1)	AD		
102	9:49b			(1)	AD		
103	9:50a		(14:34a)	(1)	AD		C
104	9:50b	(5:13b)	(14:34b)	(1)	AD	C+D	C
105	9:50c			(1)	AD		
106	10:3			Ph	AO		
107	10:5-9	19:4-6.8		Ph	AO	Ph	
108	10:11-12	19:9		XII	AD	Ph	
109	10:14	19:14	18:16	XII	AD	D	D
110	10:15	18:3	18:17	XII	AD	D	D
111	10:18-19	19:17-19	18:19-20	I	ADG	I	I
112	10:21	19:21	18:22	I	ADG	I	I
113	10:23	19:23	18:24	XII	AD	D	(2)
114	10:24			XII	AD		
115	10:25	19:24	18:25	XII	AD	D	(2)
116	10:27	19:26	18:26	XII	AD	D	(2)
117	10:29-30	19:29	18:29-30	(3)	AD	D	D
118	10:31	19:30	13:30	(3)	AD	D	(4)
119	10:33-34	20:18-19	18:31-33	XII	AD	D	D
120	10:36	20:21		(5)	AD	(6)	
121	10:38	20:22		(5)	AD	(5)	
122	10:39-40	20:23		(5)	AD	(5)	
123	10:42-44	20:25-7	cf.22:25-6	(7)	AD	(7)	D
124	10:45	20:28	cf.22:27	(7)	AD	(7)	D
125	10:49	(20:32a)	(18:40)	M	ADG		
126	10:51	20:32b	18:41	M	ADG	M	M
127	10:52		18:42	M	ADG		M
128	11:2-3	21:2-3	19:30-31	(8)	AI	(8)	(8)
129	11:14	21:19		M	AD	M	
130	11:17	21:13	19:46	P+S+C	AO	(9)	(9)
131	11:22			(10)	AD		

- 
- (1) in context John (? XII)  
 (2) 'they that heard it' (? C)  
 (3) Peter  
 (4) 'them'  
 (5) James and John  
 (6) mother of James and John  
 (7) the Ten  
 (8) 'two of his disciples'  
 (9) 'them'  
 (10) 'them' (in reply to Peter's question)



<u>No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Rodd</u>	<u>Baird</u>	<u>In Mt</u>	<u>In Lk</u>
132	11:23	21:21		XII	AD	D	
133	11:24	21:22		XII	AD	D	
134	11:25			XII			
135	11:(26)			XII			
136	11:29-30	21:24-25	20:3-4	PSEC	AO	P+E	P+S+E
137	11:33	21:27	20:8	PSEC	AO	P+E	P+S+E
138	12:1-9	21:33-41	20:9-16	PSEC	AO	P+E	C
139	12:10-11	21:42	20:17	PSEC	AO	P+E	C
140	12:15	22:18-19	20:24a	Ph+H	AO	Ph+H	(1)
141	12:16	22:20	20:24b	Ph+H	AO	Ph+H	(1)
142	12:17	22:21	20:25	Ph+H	AO	Ph+H	(1)
143	12:24-5	22:29-30		Sad	AO	Sad	
144	12:26-7	22:31-32		Sad	AO	Sad	
145	12:29-31	22:37-40	10:26-7	S	AO	(2)	(3)
146	12:34			S	AO		
147	12:35-7	22:42-5	20:41-4	C	AO	Ph	(4)
148	12:38-9	23:6-7	20:46	C	ADG	C+D	D(+C)
149	12:40	25:(14)	20:47	C	ADG	C+D	D(+C)
150	12:43-4		21:3-4	XII	AD		(5)
151	13:2	24:2	21:6	(6)	AD	D	(7)
152	13:5-37	(8)	(8)	(9)	AD	D	(7)
153	14:6-9	26:10-13		(10)	AI	D	
154	14:13-14	26:18	22:10-12	(11)	AD	D	(12)
155	14:18	26:21		XII	AD	D	
156	14:20	26:23		XII	AD	D	
157	14:21	26:24	22:22	XII	AD	D	D
158	14:22	26:26	22:19	XII	AD	D	D
159	14:24	26:28	22:20	XII	AD	D	D
160	14:25	26:29		XII	AD	D	

---

(1) spies sent by scribes and chief prieses

(2) lawyer belonging to the Pharisees

(3) lawyer

(4) 'them' (scribes)

(5) undefined

(6) 'one of his disciples'

(7) 'as some spake of the temple'

(8) no attempt is made to distinguish the sayings or trace these in Mt/Lk

(9) Peter, James, John, Andrew.

(10) those in house of Simon the leper

(11) 'two of his disciples'

(12) Peter and John



<u>No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Rodd</u>	<u>Baird</u>	<u>In Mt</u>	<u>In Lk</u>
161	14:27	26:31		XII	AD	D	
162	14:28	26:32		XII	AD	D	
163	14:30	26:34	22:34	(1)	AD	(1)	(1)
164	14:32	26:36		XII	AD	D	
165	14:34	26:38		(2)	AD	(2)	
166	14:36	26:39	22:42	(3)	AD	(3)	(3)
167	14:37	26:40		(1)	AD	(1)	
168	14:38	26:41	22:46	(2)	AD	(2)	D
169	14:41	26:45		(2)	AD	(2)	
170	14:42	26:46		(2)	AD	(2)	
171	14:48	26:55a	22:52b	(4)	AO	(4)	P+E
172	14:49	26:55b-56	22:53a	(4)	AO	(4)	P+E
173	14:62	26:64	22:69	P	AO	P	P+S+E
174	15:2	27:11	23:2	(5)	AO	(5)	(5)
175	15:34	27:46		(3)	AGO	(3)	

- 
- (1) Peter  
 (2) Peter, James, John  
 (3) Prayer  
 (4) Multitude from chief priests, scribes and elders  
 (5) Pilate

#### KEY

XII = The Twelve (in Mk)	AD = Twelve
C = Crowd	ADG = Larger group of disciples
D = Disciples (in Mt/Lk)	AI = AD + ADG
E = Elders	AGO = Opponent crowd
H = Herodians	AO = hard core opponents
I = an individual	AA = ambiguous
M = a miracle story	
P = Priests	
Ph = Pharisees	
S = Scribes	
Sad = Sadducees	



TABLE IV    PATTERN OF SAYINGS

<u>Disciples</u>	<u>Crowd</u>	<u>Opponents/others</u>
(L) 1:17	(M) 1:15	
(L) 1:38		
		(P) 1:44
		(P) 2:1-12
		(P) 2:15-17
		(P+S) 2:18-22
		(P+S) 2:23-28
		(P) 3:1-6
		(P+S) 3:22-30
	(P) 3:31-31	
	(S+M) 4:3-9	
(M+S) 4:11-20		
	(S+M) 4:21-34	
	(L) 6:4	
(M) 6:8-11		
		(P) 7:1-8
		(P) 7:9-13
	(S) 7:14-15	
(S) 7:18-23		
		(L) 7:27
		(L) 8:11-12
(M) 8:14-21		
(L) 8:27-33		
(S) 8:34-9:1	(S) 8:34-9:1	
(M) 9:9-13		
(M+S) 9:29		
(M) 9:30-32		
(M+S) 9:33-7		
(P+S) 9:38-50		
		(P) 10:2-9
(S) 10:11-12		
(P) 10:13-16		
		(L) 10:17-22
(L+S) 10:23-31		
(M) 10:32-34		
(L) 10:35-40		
(M) 10:41-45		
	(L) 11:17	(L) 11:17
(S) 11:20-25		
		(P) 11:27-33
		(S) 12:1-9
		(S) 12:10-12
		(P) 12:13-17
		(P) 12:18-27
		(P) 12:28-34
	(P) 12:35-37	
	(S) 12:38-40	
(P) 12:41-44		
(P) 13:1-2		
(M+S) 13:3-37		

KEY

L = Story about Jesus (Legende)

M = Markan construction

(Broadly after Taylor, Mark)

P = Pronouncement story

S = Saying



BIBLIOGRAPHY    LIST OF WORKS CITED

(a) Reference Books

- Bauer, W., Arndt, W.F., Gingrich, F.W., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, Chicago, 1957. (Cited as Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich)
- Brown, R.E., Fitzmer, J.A., Murphy, R.E., edd., The Jerome Biblical Commentary, London, 1970. (Cited as JBC)
- Black, M., Rowley, H.H., edd., Peake's Commentary on the Bible, London, 1962. (Cited as Peake)
- Charles, R.H., ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, with introductions and critical and explanatory notes to the several books, Oxford, 1913.
- Cheyne, T.K., Black, J.S., edd., Encyclopedia Biblica, London, 1899-1903. (Cited as EB)
- Gesenius, W., Kautzsch, E., Cowley, A.E., edd., Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, Oxford, 1910. (Cited as GK)
- Gore, C., Goudge, H.L., Guillaume, A., edd., A New Commentary on Holy Scripture including the Apocrypha, London, 1928.
- Hastings, J., ed., Dictionary of the Bible, Edinburgh, 1898-1904. (Cited as H.D.B.)
- The Interpreter's Bible, Nashville, 1951-7. (Cited IB)
- The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Nashville, 1963. (Cited as IDB)
- Kittel, Gerhard, ed., Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Stuttgart, 1933-. E.T. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Grand Rapids, 1964-. (Cited as TDNT)
- Moulton, J.H., Howard, W.F., Turner, N., A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Edinburgh, 1906-63.
- Moulton, W.F., Geden, A.S., A Concordance to the New Testament, Edinburgh, 3rd ed. 1926.
- Peake, A.S., ed., A Commentary on the Bible. With a supplement by A.J. Grieve, London, n.d.
- Strack, H.L., Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, München, 1922-8. (Cited as Strack-Billerbeck.)

(b) Commentaries on Mark

(All cited by author's surname followed by Mark regardless of the title)

- Blunt, A.W.F., The Gospel according to St. Mark, Oxford, 1929.
- Branscomb, B.H., The Gospel of Mark, London, 1937. (1952 ed. cited.)
- Carrington, P., According to Mark. A Running Commentary on the Oldest Gospel, Cambridge, 1960.
- Cranfield, C.E.B., The Gospel according to St. Mark, Cambridge, 1959. (4th ed. cited, 1972)



- Grant, F.C., The Gospel according to St. Mark, IB 7, Nashville, 1951.
- Grundmann, W., Das Evangelium nach Markus, 6th ed. Berlin, 1973.
- Haenchen, E., Der Weg Jesu. Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen, Berlin, 1966. (2nd ed. cited, 1968)
- Huby, J., L'Évangile selon Saint Marc, Paris, 1948, 2nd and 3rd edd. rev. P.-M. Benoit. (3rd Ed. cited, 1961.)
- Johnson, S.E., The Gospel according to St. Mark, London, 1960. (2nd ed. cited, 1972.)
- Klostermann, E., Das Markusevangelium, Tübingen, 4th ed. 1950 (5th ed., unaltered, cited, 1971.)
- Lagrange, M.-J., Évangile selon Saint Marc, Paris, 3rd ed. 1920 cited.
- Lohmeyer, E., Das Evangelium des Markus, Göttingen, 1937, rev. G. Sass, 1951. (17th ed. cited, 1967.)
- Loisy, A., Les Évangiles Synoptiques, Ceffonds, 1907.
- Mally, E.J., The Gospel according to Mark, JBC II, London, 1970, pp.21-61.
- Minear, P.S., Mark, London, Richmond, U.S.A., and Toronto, 1963.
- Montefiore, C.G., The Synoptic Gospels, vol.I, London, 1909.
- Moule, C.F.D., Mark, Cambridge, 1965.
- Nineham, D.E., St. Mark, Harmondsworth, 1963.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J., The Gospel according to St. Mark, London, 1925.
- Schmid, J., Das Evangelium nach Markus, Regensburg, 5th ed. 1963. (E.T. Cork, 1968, not seen.)
- Schniewind, J., Das Evangelium nach Markus, Göttingen, 1934. (10th ed. cited, 1963.)
- Schweizer, E., Das Evangelium nach Markus, Göttingen, 1967. E.T. The Good News according to Mark, London, 1971. (E.T. cited.)
- Swete, H.B., The Gospel according to St. Mark, London, 1898.
- Taylor, V., The Gospel according to St. Mark, London, 1952.
- Turner, C.H., The Gospel according to St. Mark, in Gore, Goudge, Guillaume, op.cit., Part III, pp.42-124.
- Wellhausen, J., Das Evangelium Marci, Berlin, 2nd ed. 1909.
- Wilson, R.McL., Mark, Peake, 696a-714b.
- Wood, H.G., Mark, in A Commentary on the Bible, ed. A.S.Peake, pp.681-699.

### (c) Other Works

- Aalen, S., '"Reign" and "House" in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels' (NTS 8, 1961/2, pp.215-240).
- Abrahams, I., Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, I, Cambridge, 1917, II, Cambridge, 1924.
- Aland, K., 'Bemerkungen zum Schluss des Markusevangeliums' (in Neotestamentica et Semitica, Studies in honour of Matthew Black, edd. E.E. Ellis and M. Wilcox, Edinburgh, 1969).



- Aland, K., 'Der wiedergefundene Markusschluss' (ZThK 67, 1970, pp.3-13).
- Aland, K., 'Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums' (in L'Évangile selon Marc, ed. M. Sabbe, Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. XXXIV, Gembloux, 1974, pp.435-470).
- Albertz, M., Die synoptischen Streitgespräche, Berlin, 1921.
- Alt, A., Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts, Leipzig, 1934 = Kleine Schriften I, München, 1959, pp.278-332.
- Anderson, H., and Barclay, W., edd., The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective. Essays in memory of G.H.C. MacGregor, Oxford, 1965.
- Argyle, A.W., 'Evidence for the view that St. Luke used St. Matthew's Gospel' (JBL 83, 1964, pp.390-396).
- Aune, D.E., ed., Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature. Essays in honour of Allen P. Wikgren, Leiden, 1972.
- Bacon, B.W., The Beginnings of Gospel Story, New Haven, 1909.
- Bacon, B.W., The Gospel of Mark: its Composition and Date, New Haven and London, 1925.
- Bacon, B.W., 'Pharisees and Herodians in Mark' (JBL 39, 1920, pp.102-112).
- Baird, J.A., 'A Pragmatic Approach to Parable Exegesis: some new evidence on Mk 4:11, 33-34' (JBL 76, 1957, pp.201-207).
- Baird, J.A., Audience Criticism and the Historical Jesus, Philadelphia, 1969.
- Baltensweiler, H. and Bo Reicke, edd., Neues Testament und Geschichte, Zürich and Tübingen, 1972.
- Barrett, C.K., 'Q - a re-examination' (Exp.T., 54, 1942/3, pp.320-323).
- Barrett, C.K., 'The Background of Mk 10:45' (in New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, Manchester, 1959, pp.1-18).
- Barry, F.R., Christian Ethics and Secular Society, London, 1966
- Barth, G., 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law' (in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, H.J. Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, London, 1963, pp.58-164).
- Bartsch, H.-W., 'Der Schluss des Markus-Evangeliums', (ThZ 27, 1971, pp.241-254).
- Beardslee, W.A., 'New Testament Apocalyptic in recent interpretation', (Interpretation, 25, 1971, pp.419-435).
- Beare, F.W., The Earliest Records of Jesus. A Companion to Huck's Synopsis, London, 1962.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R., Jesus and the Future, London, 1954.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R., A Commentary on Mark Thirteen, London, 1957. (Cited as Mark Thirteen.)
- Bennett, W.J., Jr., 'The Herodians of Mark's gospel' (NovT 17, 1975, pp.9-14).
- Best, E., The Temptation and the Passion: the Markan Soteriology, Cambridge, 1965.



- Best, E., The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, London, 1972.
- Best, E., 'Mark's preservation of the tradition' (in L'Évangile selon Marc, ed. M. Sabbe, Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. XXXIV, Gembloux, 1974, pp.21-34).
- Betz, O., 'The concept of the so-called "divine man" in Mark's Christology' (in D.E. Aune, ed., op.cit. pp.229-240).
- Bikerman, E., 'Les Hérodiens' (RB 47, 1938, pp.184-197).
- Bishop, E.F.F., πραξεις and πληρωματα (Exp.T. 60, 1948/9, pp.192-193).
- Black, M., An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, 2nd ed. 1954, 3rd ed. 1967.
- Blackman, E.C., 'The Hellenists of Acts 6:1' (Exp.T. 48, 1936/7, pp. 524-525).
- Blatherwick, D., 'The Markan silhouette?' (NTS 17, 1970/1, pp.184-192).
- Boers, H., Theology out of the Ghetto, Leiden, 1971.
- Boobyer, G.H., 'The eucharistic interpretation of the miracles of the loaves in St. Mark's gospel' (JTS ns 3, 1952, pp.161-171).
- Boobyer, G.H., 'The miracle of the loaves and the Gentiles in St. Mark's gospel' (SJT 6, 1953, pp.77-87).
- Boobyer, G.H., 'Mark 2:10a and the interpretation of the healing of the paralytic' (HTR 47, 1954, pp.115-120).
- Boobyer, G.H., 'The secrecy motif in St. Mark's gospel' (NTS 6, 1959/60, pp. 225-235).
- Boobyer, G.H., 'The redaction of Mk 4:1-34' (NTS 8, 1961/2, pp.59-70).
- Bornkamm, G., μυστηριον (TDNT IV pp.802-827).
- Bornkamm, G., 'Das Doppelgebot der Liebe' (Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann, 1954, pp.85-93 = Geschichte und Glaube, Erste Teil. Gesammelte Aufsätze III, 1968, pp.37-45).
- Bornkamm, G., 'End-expectation and church in Matthew' (in Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, ed. G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, H.J. Held, London, 1963, pp.15-51).
- Brandon, S.G.F., 'The date of the Markan gospel' (NTS 7, 1960/1, pp. 126-141).
- Brandon, S.G.F., 'The apologetical factor in the Markan gospel' (in Studia Evangelica II part i, The New Testament Scriptures, ed. F.L. Cross, Berlin, 1964, pp.34-46).
- Brandon, S.G.F., Jesus and the Zealots, Manchester, 1967.
- Brandon, S.G.F., The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth, London, 1968.
- Brandon, S.G.F., 'Jesus and the Zealots: Aftermath' (BJRL 54, 1971, pp.47-66).
- Braun, H., Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus, Band I, Das Spätjudentum, Band II, Die Synoptiker, Tübingen, 1957.
- Brown, J.P., 'Mark as witness to an edited form of Q' (JBL 80, 1961, pp.29-44).
- Brown, R.E., 'Parable and Allegory reconsidered' (NovT 5, 1962, pp.36-45).



- Brown, R.E., 'The semitic background of the New Testament mystêrion' (Biblica, 39, 1958, pp.426-448, 40, 1959, pp.70-87).
- Büchler, A., 'The law of purification in Mark 7:1-23' (Exp.T. 21, 1909/10, pp.34-40).
- Budesheim, T.L., 'Jesus and the disciples in conflict with Judaism' (ZNW 62, 1971, pp.191-209).
- Bultmann, R., Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, Göttingen, 1921, E.T. The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, 1963. (Cited from 2nd ed., 1972 reprint.)
- Bultmann, R., Jesus, Tübingen, 1951 ed., E.T. Jesus and the Word, London, 1935.
- Bultmann, R. Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen, 1948. E.T. Theology of the New Testament, London, 1952, 1955.
- Bultmann, R. Das Evangelium des Johannes, Göttingen, E.T. of 1964 reprint, Oxford, 1971.
- Burkill, T.A., Mysterious Revelation. An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel, Ithaca, 1963.
- Burkill, T.A., New Light on the Earliest Gospel. Seven Markan Studies, Ithaca and London, 1972.
- Butterworth, R., 'The composition of Mk 1-12' (Heythrop J. 13, 1972, pp.5-26).
- Cadbury, H.J., 'Mark 16:8' (JBL 46, 1927, pp.344ff.)
- Cadoux, C.J., The Historic Mission of Jesus, London, 1941.
- Cadoux, C.J., 'The imperatival use of  $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$  in the New Testament' (JTS 42, 1941, pp.165-173).
- Caird, G.B., 'The study of the gospels I. Reassessment of Source Criticism' (Exp.T. 87, 1976, pp.99-104).
- Calvert, D.G.A., 'An examination of the criteria for distinguishing the authentic words of Jesus' (NTS 18, 1971/2, pp.209-219).
- Carrington, P., The Primitive Christian Calendar. A study in the making of the Marcan gospel, vol.I. Introduction and Text, Cambridge, 1952.
- Carstairs, D.M., The Twice-Born, London, 1957.
- Clarke, W.K.L., New Testament Problems, London, 1929.
- Coleman, N.D., '"Salt and salted" in Mk 9:49-50' (Exp.T. 48, 1936/7, pp.360-362).
- Conzelmann, H.,  $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\kappa\tau\lambda$  (TDNT VII, p.440)
- Conzelmann, H., Die Mitte der Zeit, 1953, E.T. The Theology of St. Luke, London, 1960.
- Cranfield, C.E.B., 'St. Mark 4:1-34' (SJT 4, 1951, pp.398-414; 5, 1952, pp.49-66).
- Cranfield, C.E.B., 'St. Mark 16:1-8' (SJT 5, 1952, pp.282-298, 398-414).
- Cranfield, C.E.B., 'St. Mark 13' (SJT 6, 1953, pp.189-196, 287-303; 7, 1954, pp.284-303).
- Creed, J.M., 'The conclusion of the gospel according to St. Mark' (JTS 31, 1930, pp.175-180).
- 
- Carlston, C.E. and Norlin, D., 'Once more - statistics and Q' (ETR 64, 1971, pp.59-78).



- Cullmann, O., Baptism in the New Testament, London, 1950
- Cullmann, O., Christ and Time, London, 1951.
- Cullmann, O., The Christology of the New Testament, London, 1959.  
(Cited from 2nd ed. 1971 reprint.)
- Cullmann, O., The Early Church, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, London, 1956.  
(Cited from the shortened reprint, 1966.)
- Dalman, G., Die Worte Jesu mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache erörtert, 2nd ed. 1930. E.T. The Words of Jesus, Edinburgh, 1902.
- Daube, D., The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1956.
- Daube, D., 'Responsibilities of master and disciple in the gospels' (NTS 19, 1972/3, 1-15).
- Davies, W.D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1948.
- Davies, W.D., Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, JBL Monograph Series, VII, 1952.
- Davies, W.D., The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, Cambridge, 1964.
- de Tillesse, G. Minette, Le Secret Messianique dans l'Évangile, Paris, 1968.
- Derrett, J.D.M., Law in the New Testament, London, 1970.
- Derrett, J.D.M., 'Salted with fire. Studies in texts: Mk 9:42-50' (Theology 76, 1973, pp.364-368).
- Derrett, J.D.M., 'Fig trees in the New Testament' (Heythrop J. 14, 1974, pp.249-265).
- Devisch, M., 'La relation entre l'évangile de Marc et le document Q' (in M. Sabbe, ed., L'Évangile selon Marc, Bibl.Ephem.Theol. Lovan. XXXIV, Gembloux, 1974, pp.59-91).
- Dewar, L., An Outline of New Testament Ethics, London, 1949.
- Dibelius, M., Die Vorgeschichte des Evangeliums, Tübingen, 1919, E.T., From Tradition to Gospel, London, 1934.
- Dinkler, E., 'Jesu Wort vom Kreuztragen' (in Neutestamentlich Studien für Rudolph Bultmann, BZNW 21, 1954, pp.110-129).
- Dodd, C.H., Parables of the Kingdom, London, 1935.
- Dodd, C.H., 'The kingdom of God has come' (Exp.T. 48, 1936/7, pp.140-1).
- Doughty, D.J., 'The Presence and Future of Salvation in Corinth' (ZNW 66, 1975, pp.61-90).
- Downing, F.G., 'Towards the rehabilitation of Q' (NTS 11, 1964/5, pp.169-181).
- Ebeling, H.J., 'Die Fastenfrage (Mk 2:18-22)' (ThStK 108, 1937/8, pp.387ff.)
- Ellis, E.E., 'Jesus, the Sadducees and Qumran' (NTS 10, 1963/4, pp. 274-279).
- Emerton, J.A., 'The Aramaic background to Mk 10:45' (JTS ns 11, 1960, pp.334-335).
- Engnell, I., Critical Essays on the Old Testament, London, 1970.
- Enslin, M.S., 'ἐφάρωντο γὰρ, Mark 16:8' (JBL 46, 1927, pp.62-68).



- Evans, C.F., 'I will go before you into Galilee' (JTS ns 5, 1954, pp.3-18).
- Evans, C.F., The Beginning of the Gospel, London, 1968.
- Evans, C.F., Resurrection and the New Testament, London, 1970.
- Farmer, W.R., The Synoptic Problem, N.Y. and London, 1964.
- Farmer, W.R., 'The two-document hypothesis as a methodological criterion in synoptic research' (AngThR48, 1966, pp.380-396).
- Farrer, A.M., A Study in St. Mark, London, 1951. (Cited as Mark.)
- Farrer, A.M., 'Loaves and Thousands' (JTS ns 4, 1953, pp.1-14).
- Farrer, A.M., St. Matthew and St. Mark, London, 1954. (Cited as Matthew and Mark.)
- Farrer, A.M., 'On dispensing with Q' (in Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955).
- Farrer, A.M., 'An examination of Mark 13:10' (JTS ns 7, 1956, pp.75-9).
- Fenton, J.C., 'Paul and Mark' (in Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955, pp.89-112).
- Festinger, L., Riecken, H.W., and Schachter, S., When Prophecy Fails N.Y., 1956.
- Feuillet, A., 'Le discours de Jésus sur la ruine du temple d'après Marc XIII et Luc XXI, 5-36' (RB 55, 1948, pp.481-502; 56, 1949, pp.61-92, 340ff.; 57, 1950, pp.63ff.).
- Fitzmyer, J.A., 'The aramaic Qorbān inscription from Jebel Hallet Et-ṭūri and Mark 7:11/Mt 15:5' (JBL 78, 1959, pp.60-65).
- Flückiger, F., 'Die Redaktion der Zukunftsrede in Mk 13' (ThZ 26, 1970, pp.395-409).
- Fohrer, G., Introduction to the Old Testament, E.T. London, 1970.
- Fridrichsen, A., '"Sich selbst verleugnen"' (Conjectanea Neotestamentica, Uppsala, 1936, II, pp.108).
- Fuller, R.H., The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, 1965, (Cited from Fontana ed., 1969.)
- Furnish, V.P., The Love Commandment in the New Testament, Abingdon, 1972, London, 1973.
- Gaston, L., No Stone on Another. Studies in the significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels, Suppl. to NovT, 23, Leiden, 1970.
- Gealy, F.D., 'The composition of Mark 4' (Exp.T. 48, 1936/7, pp.40-43).
- Glasson, T.F., The Second Advent. The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine, London, 3rd ed. 1963.
- Gnilke, J., Die Verstockung Israels. Isaiah 6:9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker, München, 1961.
- Godbey, A.H., 'The Hebrew Mašal' (AJSL 39, 1922/3, pp.89-108).
- Goguel, M., 'Avec des persécutions. Étude exégétique sur Marc 10:29-30' (RHPR 8, 1928, pp.264-277).
- Grant, F.C., 'The authenticity of Jesus' sayings' (in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolph Bultmann, BZNW 21, 1954, pp.137-143).



- Grässer, E., Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte, BZfW 22, Berlin, 1957, 2nd ed. 1960.
- Grayston, K., 'The Study of Mark XIII' (Manson Memorial Lecture, BJRL 56, 1974, pp.371-387).
- Greig, J.C.G., 'The eschatological ministry' (in The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective, essays in memory of G.H.C. MacGregor, edd. H. Anderson and W. Barclay, Oxford, 1965, pp.99-131).
- Grundmann, W.,  $\delta\epsilon\iota$ ,  $\delta\epsilon\omega\nu$   $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$  (TDNT II pp.21-25).
- Guy, H.A., 'Mark 13:14' (Exp.T. 65, 1953/4, p.30).
- Guy, H.A., 'Did Luke use Matthew?' (Exp. 83, 1971/2, pp.245-247).
- Hahn, F., Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum, FRLANT 83, Göttingen, 2nd ed. 1964, E.T. Titles of Jesus in Christology, London, 1969.
- Hartman, L., Prophecy Interpreted. The Formation of some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par., Lund, 1966.
- Hauck, F.,  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\epsilon\lambda\eta$  (TDNT V pp.744-761).
- Herbert, A.S., 'The parable (mašal) in the Old Testament' (SJT 7, 1954, pp.180-196).
- Hickling, C.J.A., 'A problem of method in gospel research' (RS 10, 1974, pp.339-346).
- Hiers, R.H., Jesus and Ethics: Four Interpretations, Philadelphia, 1968.
- Higgins, A.J.B., ed., New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, Manchester, 1959.
- Hoehner, H.W., Herod Antipas, Cambridge, 1972.
- Hooker, M.D., The Son of Man in Mark, London, 1967.
- Hooker, M.D., 'Christology and methodology', NTS 17, 1970/1, pp.480-487).
- Houlden, J.L., Ethics and the New Testament, Harmondsworth, 1973.
- Jackson, F.J. Foakes, and Kirsopp Lake, edd., The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I The Acts of the Apostles, London, 1920-1933.
- Jeremias, J., 'Zur Hypothese einer schriftliche Logienquelle Q', (ZNW 29, 1930, pp.147-149).
- Jeremias, J., 'Mk 10:13-16 Parr. und die Übung der Kindertaufe in der Urkirche' (ZNW 40, 1941, pp.243-245).
- Jeremias, J., Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, London, 1960.
- Jeremias, J., The Sermon on the Mount, London, 1961.
- Jeremias, J., The Origins of Infant Baptism, London, 1963.
- Jeremias, J., The Parables of Jesus, London, 1954, cited from revised ed. 1963.
- Jeremias, J., The Prayers of Jesus, London, 1967.
- Jeremias, J., Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, London, 1969.
- Jeremias, J., New Testament Theology I, London, 1971. (Cited as Theology I.)



- Johnson, A.R., לִשְׁמִי (in Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East, Suppl. VT III, Leiden, 1955, pp.162-169).
- Johnston, E.D., 'The Johannine Version of the Feeding of the Five Thousand - an independent tradition?' (NTS 8, 1961/2, pp.151-154).
- Joüon, P., 'Les "Hérodiens" de l'Évangile' (RSR 28, 1938, pp.585-588).
- Kilpatrick, G.D., The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, Oxford, 1946.
- Kilpatrick, G.D., 'The Gentile mission in Mark and Mk 13:9-11' (in Studies in the Gospels ed. D.E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955, pp.145ff.).
- Kilpatrick, G.D., 'Mark 13:9-10' (JTS ns 9, 1958, pp.81-86).
- Knigge, H.D., 'The Meaning of Mark' (Interpretation 22, 1968, pp.53-70).
- Knox, W.L., The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels. Vol I, St. Mark, ed. H. Chadwick, Cambridge, 1953.
- Koch, K., The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic, London, 1972 (E.T. of Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik, Gütersloh, 1970).
- Kraeling, C.H., 'Mark 16:8' (JBL 45, 1926, pp.357-358).
- Kümmel, W.G., Promise and Fulfilment, London, 1957, 2nd ed. 1961.
- Kümmel, W.G., Introduction to the New Testament, London, 1966, 2nd revised ed. 1975.
- Ladd, G.E., Jesus and the Kingdom. The Eschatology of Biblical Realism, N.Y. 1964, London, 1966.
- Lambrecht, J., Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse, Rome, 1967.
- Lambrecht, J., 'Redaction and Theology in Mk IV' (in M. Sabbe, ed., L'Évangile selon Marc., Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan XXXIV, Gembloux, 1974, pp.269-307).
- Lightfoot, R.H., History and Interpretation in the Gospels, London, 1935.
- Lightfoot, R.H., Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels, London, 1938.
- Lightfoot, R.H., The Gospel Message of St. Mark, Oxford, 1950. (Cited as Gospel Message.)
- Lillie, W., Studies in New Testament Ethics, Edinburgh, 1961.
- Lindars, B., New Testament Apologetic, London, 1961.
- Lindars, B., The Gospel of John, London, 1972.
- Linneman, E., 'Der (wiedergefundene) Markusschluss' (ZThK 66, 1969, pp.255-287).
- Linton, O., 'The Q-Problem Reconsidered' (in Aune, D.E., ed., Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature, Leiden, 1972, pp.43-59).
- Loevestam, E., Spiritual Wakefulness in the New Testament, Lund, 1963. (This was not available to me.)
- Lohmeyer, E., Galiläa und Jerusalem, Göttingen, 1936.
- Lohse, E., ἑρμηνεία (TDNT VI pp.961-965).
- Lohse, E., ed., Die Texte aus Qumran, München, 2nd ed., 1971.
- Luz, U., 'Das Geheimnismotiv und die markinische Christologie' (ZNW 56, 1965, pp.9-30).



- McKane, W., Proverbs, London, 1970.
- Mánek, J., 'Fishers of men' (NovT 2, 1957, pp.138-141).
- Manson, T.W., The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1935.
- Manson, T.W., The Sayings of Jesus, London, 1949.
- Manson, T.W., 'The cleansing of the Temple' (BJRL 33, 1951, pp.271-282).
- Manson, W., Jesus the Messiah, London, 1943.
- Margoliouth, G., 'The tradition of the elders' (St. Mark 7:1-23)' (Exp. T. 22, 1910/1, pp.261-263).
- Marshall, L.H., The Challenge of New Testament Ethics, London, 1956.
- Martin, R.P., 'St. Matthew's Gospel in recent study' (Exp.T. 80, 1968/9, pp.132-136).
- Martin, R.P., 'A gospel in search of a life-setting' (Exp.T. 80, 1968/9, pp.361-364).
- Martin, R.P., Mark: Evangelist and Theologian, Exeter, 1972.
- Marxsen, W., 'Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabletheorie des Markus' (ZThK 52, 1955, pp.255-271).
- Marxsen, W., Der Evangelist Markus, FRLANT 67, Göttingen, 2nd ed. 1959, E.T. Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel, Nashville, 1969.
- Marxsen, W., The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, London, 1970.
- Mauser, U., Christ in the Wilderness. The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition, London, 1963.
- Mead, R.T., 'The healing of the paralytic - a unit?' (JBL 80, 1961, pp.348-354).
- Meye, R.P., Jesus and the Twelve. Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel, Grand Rapids, 1968.
- Meyer, E., Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums I, Stuttgart-Berlin, 1921, Darmstadt, 1962.
- Michaelis, W., 'Kennen die Synoptiker eine Verzögerung der Parusie?' (in Synoptische Studien A. Wikenhauser dargebracht, München, 1953, pp.107-123).
- Milik, J.T., Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, London, 1959.
- Miner, P.S., 'Audience Criticism and Markan Ecclesiology' (in Neues Testament und Geschichte, ed. H. Baltensweiler und Bo Reicke, Zürich and Tübingen, 1972, pp.79-89).
- Miner, P.S., 'Jesus' Audiences according to Luke' (NovT 16, 1974, pp.81-109).
- Moore, A.L., The Parousia in the New Testament, Leiden, 1966.
- Mosley, A.W., 'Jesus' audiences in the gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke' (NTS 10, 1963/4, pp.139-149).
- Moule, C.F.D., 'St. Mark 16:8 once more' (NTS 2, 1955/6, pp.58-59).



- Moule, C.F.D., Review of Studies in the Gospels: Essays in memory of R.H. Lightfoot (JTS ns 7, 1956, pp.280-282).
- Moule, C.F.D., An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, Cambridge, 1959.
- Moule, C.F.D., ed., The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ, London, 1968.
- Neirynck, F., '"The tradition of the sayings of Jesus" - a discussion based on Mark 9:33-50' (Concilium, Vol 10 no. 2, 1966, pp.33-39).
- Nineham, D.E., ed., Studies in the Gospels: Essays in memory of R.H. Lightfoot, Oxford, 1955.
- Norman, F., Christos Didaskalos, Münster, 1966.
- O'Collins, G. The Easter Jesus, London, 1973.
- Oepke, A., γρηγορεω (TDNT II pp.338-339).
- Ottley, R.R., 'ἐφ' ὧν γὰρ Mark 16:8' (JTS 27, 1927, pp.407-409).
- Perrin, N., The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, London, 1963.
- Perrin, N., Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, London, 1967.
- Perrin, N., What is Redaction Criticism?, London, 1970.
- Perrin, N., 'The Christology of Mark: a study in methodology' (JR 51, 1971, pp.173-187).
- Perrin, N., 'The Christology of Mark' (in M. Sabbe, ed., L'Évangile selon Marc, Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. XXXIV, Gembloux, 1974, pp.471-485). This is a slightly revised form of the previous article.
- Pesch, R., Naherwartungen. Tradition und Redaktion in Mark 13, Düsseldorf, 1968.
- Pryor, J.W., 'Markan parable theology: an inquiry into Mark's principles of redaction' (Exp.T. 83, 1971/2, pp.242-245).
- Quesnell, Q., The Mind of Mark. Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6:52, Rome, 1969.
- Ramsey, P., Basic Christian Ethics, London, 1953.
- Rengstorff, H., διδάσκω (TDNT II pp.135-165).
- Replöh, K.-G., Markus - Lehrer der Gemeinde, Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien 9, Stuttgart, 1969.
- Riddle, D.W., 'Mark 4:1-34; the evolution of a gospel source' (JBL 56, 1937, pp.77-90).
- Rigaux, B., The Testimony of St. Mark, E.T. Chicago, 1966.
- Ristow, H. and Matthiae, K., edd., Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus, Berlin, 1960.
- Robinson, D.F., 'The parable of the loaves' (AngTR 39, 1957, pp.107-115).
- Robinson, J.M., The Problem of History in Mark, London, 1957.
- Robinson, J.M., 'The literary composition of Mark' (in M. Sabbe, ed., L'Évangile selon Marc, Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan. XXXIV, Gembloux, 1974, pp.11-19).



- Robinson, J.A.T., Jesus and His Coming: The emergence of a doctrine, London, 1957.
- Rohde, J., Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, London, 1968.
- Rosché, Th., 'The words of Jesus and the future of the "Q" hypothesis' (JBL 79, 1960, pp.210-220).
- Rousseau, F., 'La Structure de Marc 13' (Biblica 56, 1975, pp.157-172).
- Rowley, H.H., 'The Herodians in the gospels' (JTS 41, 1940, pp.14-27).
- Sabbe, M., ed., L'Évangile selon Marc - Tradition et Rédaction, Bibl. Ephem.Theol.Lovan. XXXIV, Gembloux, 1974.
- Sanday, W., 'Jesus Christ' (HDB II pp.603-653).
- Sanday, W., Outlines of the Life of Christ, Edinburgh, 2nd ed. 1906.
- Sanday, W., ed., Studies in the Synoptic Problem, Oxford, 1911.
- Sanders, E.P., 'The argument from order and the relationship between Matthew and Luke' (NTS 15, 1968/9, pp.249-261).
- Sanders, E.P., 'The overlaps of Mark and Q and the synoptic problem', (NTS 19, 1972/3, pp.453-465).
- Sandmel, S., 'Herodians' (IDB II pp.394-5).
- Schäfer, K.Th., '... und dann werden sie fasten, an jenem Tage' (in Synoptische Studien A. Wikenhauser dargebracht, München, 1953, pp.124-147).
- Schilling, F.A., 'What means the saying about receiving the Kingdom of God as a little child (την βασιλειαν του θεου ὡς παιδίου)? Mk 10:15; Lk 18:17' (Exp.T. 77, 1965/6, pp.56-58).
- Schmiedel, P.W., 'Gospels' (EB vol 2).
- Schmithals, W., 'Der Markusschluss, die Verklärungsgeschichte und die Aussendung der Zwölf' (ZThK 69, 1972, pp.379-411).
- Schnackenburg, R., 'Mark 9:33-50' (in Synoptische Studien A. Wikenhauser dargebracht, München, 1953, pp.184-206).
- Schnackenburg, R., God's Rule and Kingdom, Edinburgh and London, 1963.
- Schreiber, J., 'Die Christologie des Markusevangelium. Beobachtung zur Theologie und Komposition des zweiten Evangeliums' (ZThK 58, 1961, pp.154-183).
- Schreiber, J., Theologie des Vertrauens. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Markusevangeliums, Hamburg, 1967.
- Schulz, A., Nachfolgen und Nachahmen, StANT 6, München, 1962.
- Schulz, S., 'Die Bedeutung des Markus für die Theologie des Urchristentums' (Studia Evangelica II, ed. F. Cross, Berlin 1964, pp.135-145).
- Schulz, S., Die Stunde der Botschaft. Eine Einführung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten, Hamburg, 1967.
- Schweitzer, A., The Mystery of the Kingdom of God, London, 1914 (E.T. of the first part of Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis. Eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu, Tübingen, 1901).
- Schweitzer, A., The Quest of the Historical Jesus, London, 1910, 3rd ed. 1964 (E.T. of Von Reimarus zu Wrede, Tübingen, 1906).



- Schweizer, E., 'Anmerkungen zur Theologie des Markus' (in Neotestamentica et Patristica, ed. W.C. van Unnik, Suppl. NovT 6, Leiden, 1962, pp.35-46).
- Sharp, D.S., 'Mark 2:10' (Exp.T. 38, 1926/7, pp.428-429).
- Shaw, R.H., 'A conjecture on the signs of the End' (AngTR 47, 1965, pp.96-102).
- Simonsen, H., 'Zur Frage der grundlegenden Problematik in form- und redaktionsgeschichtlicher Evangelienforschung' (StTh 27, 1972, pp.1-23).
- Simpson, R.T., 'The major agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark' (NTS 12, 1965/6, pp.273-284).
- Sjöberg, E., Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien, Lund, 1955. (Not seen.)
- Smith, C.W.F., 'Fishers of men. Footnotes on a gospel figure' (HTR 52, 1959, pp.187-203).
- Soiron, Th., Die Logia Jesu. Untersuchung zum synoptischen Problem, NTAbh 6, Münster, 1916.
- Stein, R.H., 'What is Redaktionsgeschichte?' (JBL 88, 1969, pp.45-56).
- Stein, R.H., 'The "Redaktionsgeschichtlich" investigation of a Markan Seam (Mk 1:21f.)' (ZNW 61, 1970, pp.70-94).
- Stein, R.H., 'The proper methodology for ascertaining a Markan redaction history' (NovT 13, 1971, pp.181-188).
- Stein, R.H., 'A short note on Mk 14:28 and 16:7' (NTS 20, 1973/4, pp.445-452).
- Streeter, B.H., 'St. Mark's knowledge and use of Q' (in Studies in the Synoptic Problem, ed. W. Sanday, Oxford, 1911, pp.165-183).
- Streeter, B.H., 'The literary evolution of the gospels' (in W. Sanday, ibid. pp.209-227).
- Streeter, B.H., The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins, London, 1924 (Cited from 7th impression, 1951).
- Stuhlmacher, P., 'Thesen zur Methodologie gegenwärtiger Exegese' (ZNW 63, 1972, pp.18-26).
- Suhl, A., Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium, Gütersloh, 1965.
- Sundwall, J., Die Zusammensetzung des Markusevangeliums, Acta Academiae Åboensis Humaniora IX.2, Åbo, 1934.
- Taylor, V., 'The messianic secret in Mark' (Exp.T. 59, 1947/8, pp.146-151).
- Taylor, V., 'W. Wrede's The Messianic Secret in the Gospels' (Exp.T. 65, 1953/4, pp.248-250).
- Taylor, V., The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, London, 1933. (Cited from 2nd ed., 1945 reprint.)
- Taylor, V., 'The messianic secret in Mark. A rejoinder to the Rev. Dr. T.A. Burkill' (Hib.J. 55, 1956/7, pp.241-248).
- Taylor, V., The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching, London, 1958.
- Throckmorton, B.H., 'Did Mark know Q?' (JBL 67, 1948, pp.319-329).



- Tödt, H.E., The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, London, 1965, E.T. of Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung, Gütersloh, 1959.
- Trench, R.C., Synonyms of the New Testament, London, 1906.
- Trocme, E., La Formation de l'Évangile selon Marc, Paris, 1963, E.T. The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark, London, 1975.
- Trocme, E., Jesus and his Contemporaries, London, 1973, E.T. of Jésus de Nazareth vu par les témoins de sa vie, Neuchâtel, 1972.
- Trompf, G.W., 'The first resurrection appearance and the ending of Mark's gospel' (NTS 18, 1972, pp.308-330).
- Turner, C.H., 'Markan Usage: Notes, critical and exegetical, on the Second Gospel' (JTS 26, 1925, pp.12-20, 145-156, 225-240, 337-346; 27, 1926, pp.58-62).
- Turner, N., 'Q in recent thought' (Exp.T. 80, 1968/9, pp.324-8).
- Tyson, J.B., 'The blindness of the disciples in Mark' (JBL 80, 1961, pp.261-268).
- Van der Horst, P.W., 'Can a book end with  $\gamma\alpha\upsilon$ ? A note on Mark 16:8' (JTS ns 23, 1972, pp.121-124).
- Van Unnik, W.C., ed., Neotestamentica et Patristica, Suppl. NovT 6, Leiden, 1962.
- Vermes, G., The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Harmondsworth, 1962, cited from 1972 revised reprint.
- Vermes, G., Jesus the Jew, London, 1973.
- Vermes, G., 'The use of Bar Nash/Bar Nasha in Jewish Aramaic' (in M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, 3rd ed., 1967, pp.310-328).
- Via, D.O., Jr., Kerygma and Comedy in the New Testament, Philadelphia, 1975.
- Vielhauer, P., 'Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markus-evangeliums' (in Zeit und Geschichte, Bultmann Festschrift, ed. E. Dinkler, Tübingen, 1964, pp.154-169, also in Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament, München, 1965, pp.199-214).
- Weiss, J., History of Primitive Christianity I, London, 1937.
- Wenham, D., 'The Synoptic Problem Revisited: some new suggestions about the composition of Mark 4:1-34' (Tyndale New Testament Lecture 1971, Tyndale Bulletin, 1972, pp.3-38).
- Werner, M., Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas problemgeschichtlich dargestellt, 1941. Abridged E.T. The Formation of Christian Dogma, London, 1957.
- Werner, M., Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium, BZNW 1, Giessen, 1923.
- Wilder, A.N., 'Eschatological imagery and earthly circumstances' (NTS 5, 1958/9, pp.229-245).
- Wink, W., John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition, Cambridge, 1968.
- Wrede, W., Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien, Göttingen, 1901, E.T. The Messianic Secret, London, 1971.



Yadin, Y., The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, Oxford, 1962.

(d) Abbreviations

(Abbreviations already noted not included.)

AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
AngTR	Anglican Theological Review.
Bibl.Ephem.Theol.Lovan.	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
BZNW	Beihefte zur ZNW.
Exp.T.	Expository Times.
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments.
HeythropJ	Heythrop Journal.
HibJ	Hibbert Journal.
HTR	Harvard Theological Review.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature.
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies.
NovT	Novum Testamentum.
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen.
NTS	New Testament Studies.
RB	Revue Biblique.
RHPR	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses.
RS	Religious Studies.
RSR	Revue de Sciences Religieuses.
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology.
StANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament.
StTh	Studia Theologica.
ThStK	Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift.
VT	Vetus Testamentum.
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZThK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.